



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-155
Friday
10 August 1990

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-155

CONTENTS

10 August 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Grinevskiy Sees 'Tough Test' in Vienna Talks [TASS]	1
Commentary Calls for 'Preserving' ABM Treaty [TASS]	1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports on Gremitskikh's 9 Aug Briefing	3
Participation in Gulf Force	3
Soviet Reaction to Gulf Crisis	3
USSR on Arab 'Unification'	3
Soviet-PRC Border Talks	4
PRC-Indonesia Relations	4
PRC's Position on Cambodia	4
U.S.-Vietnamese Contacts	4
Increased Afghan Rebel Activity	4
Thatcher's Remarks on Europe	5
UN Council for Iraq Sanctions Begins Work [TASS]	5
Commentator Praises Sino-Indonesian Relations [Moscow International]	5
Spain Permits U.S. To Use Bases for Airlift [TASS]	6
Portugal Permits U.S. Use of Air Bases [TASS]	6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Naval Squadron To Visit Vladivostok [TASS]	7
U.S. Consul in Leningrad Tours Lithuania [Vilnius Radio]	7
Canadian Defense Chief Gives News Briefing [Moscow TV]	7

China

Ministry Welcomes Chinese-Indonesian Ties [Moscow International]	7
Renewed Sino-Indonesian Ties Viewed [TASS]	8
Joint Economic, Trade Commission With China Meets [Moscow International]	8
Chinese Scientific, Technical Exhibit Opens 2 Aug [PRAVDA 2 Aug]	9
Conflict With Chinese Auto Workers Reported [Moscow International]	9

Northeast Asia

Restructured Economic Ties With DPRK Urged [PRAVDA 6 Aug]	10
Preview of 26 Aug Elections in Mongolia Reported [Moscow Radio]	11
Russian Prime Minister Meets With Japanese Envoy [TASS]	12
Japanese Peace Group To Aid Chernobyl Victims [TASS]	12

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S Change on Cambodia Termed 'Good News' [Moscow International]	13
--	----

Near East & South Asia

TASS Presents Ministry's Statement on Gulf	13
Shevardnadze, Baker Confer on Gulf Situation [TASS]	14
Belonogov, Iranian Envoy Discuss Developments [TASS]	14
General Predicts 'Reasonable' End to Situation [Paris TV]	14
International Responses to Gulf Crisis Reported	14
U.S. President Gives Address [TASS]	14
Western Nations Deploy Ships [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Aug]	15
UN Labels Annexation 'Void' [TASS]	15
U.S. Troops 'Flooding' Region [TASS]	16
Egypt's Mubarak Schedules Emergency Arab Summit	16
Iraq Presented With 'Ultimatum' [IZVESTIYA 10 Aug]	16
Iraqi Demands Delay Summit [TASS]	17
Gorbachev Sends Message [TASS]	17
Baghdad Celebrates 'Annexation' of Kuwait [PRAVDA 10 Aug]	17
Kuwaiti Envoy Interviewed on Gulf Situation	17
Requests Increased Support [Moscow TV]	17
Conveys 'Gratitude' to Gorbachev [TRUD]	18
Comparison of Kuwait Embassy Statement on Gulf	19
Iraqi, Kuwaiti Students in Moscow Demand Pullout [IZVESTIYA 10 Aug]	19
Democratic Party Rallies To Oppose Invasion [Moscow TV]	19
Phone-In Program Assesses Invasion's Impact [Moscow TV]	20
Commentaries Review, Assess Iraqi Invasion	21
Peace Could Be 'Jeopardized' [Moscow TV]	21
Crisis Takes On 'Dangerous Scope' [Radio Peace and Progress]	21
'Act of International Terrorism' [Radio Peace and Progress]	22
U.S., Soviet Views 'Coincide' [Moscow Radio]	22
'Concern' Over U.S. Buildup [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Aug]	23
American Goals Questioned [PRAVDA 10 Aug]	24
Prospect of Clash Growing [PRAVDA 10 Aug]	24
Embargo, Sanctions Hurt Iraq [IZVESTIYA 10 Aug]	25
Iraqi Invasion Assailed [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Aug]	26

Sub-Saharan Africa

RSA Government, ANC Reach 'Historic' Agreement [TASS]	28
South African Ties Depend on End to Apartheid [TASS]	28
RSA Officials To Help Clean Up Chernobyl [TASS]	28

East Europe

'Rift' Seen Between Polish Party Leaders [NEW TIMES No 31]	29
Poland Proposes Opening Consulate in Riga [Riga Radio]	31

West Europe

Laptev Confers With Nordic Council Chairman [TASS]	32
Finnish Consul Visits Lithuania 22-24 Jul [EKHO LITVY 25 Jul]	32
FRG Interested in Buying GDR MiG's [Moscow TV]	32

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Decree on State Property Fund Published [TASS]	33
Abalkin Views Aims of Decree [Moscow TV]	33
Petrakov Calls for Legalizing Private Property [TASS]	33
Yeltsin Meets Working Group on Market Economy [IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]	34
Kirghiz, Uzbek Spokesmen Address Treaty Group [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Aug]	34
Hijacking Attempt Thwarted in Orel 9 Aug [TASS]	35

Gorbachev Sends Greeting to Young Pioneers [TASS]	35
MVD's Bakatin Discusses Crime Statistics [IZVESTIYA 5 Aug]	35
Case Against KGB's Kalugin Reported [MOSCOW NEWS No 31]	40
CPSU Deputies Criticized for Careerism [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jul]	41
Delays at Border Checkpoint Engender 'Tension' [Moscow Radio]	43

Economic

Implementation of Small Business Law Discussed [Moscow Radio]	43
New Resolution on Monetary Exchange Discussed [TASS]	44
Leasehold Coal Mine Faces Pioneering Problems [Moscow TV]	44
City-Country Relations Improving in Belgorod [Moscow TV]	45

Agricultural

Commentator Analyzes Government Harvest Figures [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 10 Aug]	45
Details Given of New Purchase Prices for Produce [PRAVDA 10 Aug]	46
States of Emergency Declared in Many Regions	46
Kuybyshev Oblast [Moscow Radio]	46
Smolensk Oblast [Moscow Radio]	47
Cooperation Plan Helps Solve Farm Labor Problem [Moscow TV]	47
Price System Hinders Leaseholding in Kazakhstan [Moscow TV]	47
Government Sets New Produce Prices for 1 Jan [Moscow TV]	48

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts Make Safe Return to Earth	48
Interviewed After Landing [Moscow TV]	48
Work of New Crew Detailed [Moscow Radio]	49
Separate Return of Cargo in Future [TASS]	49
Use of Space Technology for Consumer Goods Viewed [Moscow International]	49
IAEA Mission Begins Analysis in Belorussia [TASS]	50

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Red Army Soldiers Guard Monuments in Baltics [TASS]	51
Estonia's Savisaar Holds Talks With Ryzhkov	51
No Agreements Reached [Moscow TV]	51
Savisaar Interviewed on Talks [Tallinn Radio]	51
Pskov-Estonia Border Change Efforts Reviewed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jul]	52
People's Front of Latvia Slated To Meet 11 Aug [Riga Radio]	53
Latvian Council Meets To Consider Land Reform [Riga Radio]	54
Latvia's Rubiks Attends Belorussia Border Talks [Moscow Radio]	54
Firm Suggests Barter To Cope With Shortages [Moscow TV]	54
Vilnius Issues Statement on Talks With Russia [Vilnius Radio]	54
Lithuanian Supreme Council Bans Popular Tabloid [Vilnius International]	55
Lithuanian Communist Party Adopts Guidelines [EKHO LITVY 22 Jun]	55
Lithuanian Six-Month Economic Performance Noted [EKHO LITVY 12 Jul]	56
Deputy Explains Lithuanian Foreign Policy [Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY 1 Aug]	57

RSFSR

Russia Declares Union Economic Deals Invalid [TASS]	58
Yeltsin Visits Bashkir, Tatar ASSR	58
Visits Nuclear Power Station [Moscow TV]	58
'Ambitious' Tour Assessed [Moscow Radio]	58
Third Day of Tataria Visit [PRAVDA 9 Aug]	59
Background on Visit to Tataria [IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]	59
Concludes Tataria Tour [TASS]	60
Arrives in Bashkiria [TASS]	60

Yeltsin Interviewed on Latvia Visit, Future	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Aug]	61
Kaliningrad To Disband Rayon Committees	[Moscow Radio]	64

Western Republics

Ukraine CP Protests Dismantling of Lenin Statues	[Moscow TV]	64
Donetsk Miners Oust Party Committee	[Moscow TV]	64
Belorussia's Dementey Interviewed on Sovereignty	[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 12 Jul]	65

Caucasus

Armenian President on National Forces, Karabakh	[Vienna TV]	70
Karabakh Committee Member Views NKAO Tension	[KOMSOMOLETS 10 Jul]	71
Armenian Supreme Soviet Continues Deliberations		73
'Vremya' Report Discussed	[Yerevan Radio]	73
Independence Debated Further	[Moscow TV]	73
Debate Proposal Postponed	[Yerevan Radio]	73
Draft Declaration Viewed	[Yerevan International]	73
Armenian National Army Commander Interviewed	[Moscow Radio]	74
Armenian Revolutionary Federation Issues Statement	[Yerevan Radio]	74
Revolutionary Party Legalized	[TASS]	75
Attacks Involving Firearms Reported in Armenia		75
Weapons Surrendered to MVD	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Aug]	75
Anti-Crime Official Killed	[Moscow Radio]	75
Situation in NKAO, Plans To Open Road Noted	[Yerevan Radio]	76
Azerbaijani Minister Cited on President's Decree	[Moscow TV]	76
Arrival of Refugees in Azerbaijan Reported	[Baku Radio]	76

Grinevskiy Sees 'Tough Test' in Vienna Talks

LD0908210390 Moscow TASS in English 2051 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna August 9 TASS—The ongoing round of the Vienna talks on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe will be the longest at the forum.

Twenty-three participants in the talks from the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, determined to settle remaining problems and prepare a final treaty for the forthcoming European summit in Paris in November, have decided to scrap their vacations and retire only for a short, "technical break."

Painstaking everyday work to prepare negotiated formulations is producing tangible results. According to some estimates, more than 30 per cent of the treaty's final text has been agreed upon, as well as nearly half of the protocol on inspections and other documents.

The agreement reached on tanks in Europe has given rise to hopes for a quick settlement on disputed issues.

Major political developments, including the London NATO summit, West German Chancellor Kohl's visit to the Soviet Union and talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev and the Paris two plus four meeting of foreign ministers, gave rise to more hopes.

However, the one and a half months that passed since the resolution of the problem of tanks and armoured vehicles have failed to produce equally tangible results.

The talks stagnated and there is now a threat of a deadlock.

This suits no one, according to negotiators from different countries.

German unification has offered a chance to bridge the rift in Europe. However, the process spawned several problems, including in the context of the European Security, that should be considered and reflected in the Vienna Treaty.

Efforts to link limitations on the united Germany's armed forces with the negotiating process are one of these problems.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl agreed last month to limit these forces to 370,000 men within the next three to four years, chief Soviet negotiator Oleg Grinevskiy told TASS.

"Our specific task is to translate the agreement into the legal language in the framework of the Vienna talks," he said.

"This is a complex, delicate issue, that will require time and inventiveness," he said.

The united Germany, its membership in NATO and Soviet withdrawal from central Europe create a new situation in the region, he went on.

A question arises how to coordinate these changes with the framework of the regional division in central Europe and subdivide regional sublevels between two groups of member-states, he said.

The role of the principle of sufficiency of forces for a single country, limited under the treaty, is becoming even more important, he said.

"We also face several major problems from the previous stages of our talks," he said.

Aviation is one of them. The debate on the issue has been long and difficult, but has led to some progress. The sides have agreed on certain positions, giving rise to hopes for a possible solution, he said.

The remaining part of the current round will be a tough test for participants in the Vienna talks, Grinevskiy believes.

It will test their professional skills, flexibility, their ability to cooperate with partners and their capitals and take tough but vital decisions, he said.

"In this situation it is especially important to realise that we pursue a common cause and bear equal responsibility," he said.

Commentary Calls for 'Preserving' ABM Treaty

LD0908191690 Moscow TASS in English 1906 GMT
9 Aug 90

["TASS Comment" by military writer Vladimir Chernyshov: "American SDI and ABM Treaty"]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] Organization Director Henry Cooper declared for modernising and actually revising the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems (ABM).

Why did Cooper need to make statements in this vein?

In its work on SDI, which envisages building a large-scale anti-missile system, the Pentagon seems to have approached the point where the planned tests of weapons will constitute a direct violation of the ABM Treaty. This treaty begins seriously to stand in the way of the U.S. Defence Department.

At the same time, it is obvious that the SDI programme found itself on the threshold. Disputes about the programme in the United States have assumed a political nature.

Recent events such as sweeping changes in the Soviet Union and in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation as a whole, the erosion of the enemy image and the reality of reaching an agreement on drastic reductions in strategic

offensive armaments at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva are crossing out any reasons for building strategic defence systems.

The popularity of SDI among Americans has nosedived. Attitude to this programme at the U.S. Congress has also become more critical. It is increasingly difficult for the Pentagon to push through appropriations for the project.

Small wonder, in these conditions Cooper is out to find some new reason for keeping work within the SDI framework going and for revising the ABM Treaty. But they look, to put it mildly, unconvincing.

Take, for instance, the argument that technical advances made during the development of the SDI systems will give the United States extra trump cards at talks with the USSR. But talks from the position of strength can hardly be productive today. This approach can only hamper the elaboration of mutually acceptable solutions.

Another argument by Cooper sounds even more surprising. According to him, changing the ABM Treaty is allegedly one area of the common interests of the United States and the USSR in the context of the talks. The head of the American programme is sure to know well the Soviet Union's stance.

The USSR firmly believes that the understandings regarding the role of the ABM Treaty, elaborated by Washington and Moscow in 1972, remain in force.

This treaty continues to preserve its importance as the basis of maintaining strategic stability, the mandatory condition for implementing accords to reduce strategic offensive armaments.

Preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty rather than revising it is in the interests of both the USSR and the United States. If one of the sides moves to violate the treaty, this could jeopardise the supreme interests of the other side and would give it the right to withdraw from a treaty on strategic offensive armaments.

TASS Reports on Gremitskikh's 9 Aug Briefing

Participation in Gulf Force

LD0908130290 Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—"At this stage we are not considering taking part in the multinational force, the naval blockade or any other measures outside the framework of Security Council decisions," a Soviet spokesman told a news briefing in Moscow today.

Asked about Soviet participation in the multinational force in the Persian Gulf, Yuri Gremitskikh said "The Soviet position is that the settlement of the situation related to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait must follow coordinated actions within the framework of the UN Security Council."

"If this organisation takes any decisions regarding the use of multinational forces, the Soviet Union will elaborate its own line of conduct, proceeding from this."

Soviet Reaction to Gulf Crisis

LD0908162890 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—Asked how the Soviet Union looks at the escalation of U.S. naval and other forces in the Persian Gulf area at a briefing here today, senior Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuri Gremitskikh cited the contents of two telephone conversations between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on August 7, saying:

"Shevardnadze took notice of Baker's assurances that the deployment of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia is a temporary, emergency measure and that they will be withdrawn from that country as soon as circumstances allow."

Speaking about Soviet citizens now in Iraq and Kuwait, Gremitskikh recalled that there are about 9,000 of them there. "Naturally, we are concerned because clashes and shootouts have not ceased in Kuwait. Any state is worried about the fate of its citizens in a zone where developments take such a sharp turn."

Simultaneously, Gremitskikh talked about contacts between Soviet representatives and "respective authorities," during which, he said, "We reminisce about our concern and ask them to take it into account."

"In talks with diplomatic representatives, senior officials of the Soviet Foreign Ministry repeatedly pointed to the need for our people and their families be secure," he

added. "Everything will depend on the development of the situation, on authorities in Iraq and Kuwait, which are duty bound, under international legal standards, not to allow any harm to come to foreigners, including Soviet citizens."

Western journalists were interested in the USSR's reaction to the possible Iraqi use of chemical weapons.

"The Soviet stance regarding the use of chemical weapons is clear," Gremitskikh said. "We stand for the elimination, nonuse, nonproliferation and nonpossession of these weapons, for destroying almost all of their stocks without waiting for the conclusion of a comprehensive convention on chemical weapons. If it occurs to someone to use this weapon somewhere or specifically in this situation, I think it would be a terrible turn in the events in the Persian Gulf area, appalling as they are."

On the Soviet Union's responsibility for participation in arming Iraq, Gremitskikh recognised that Iraq does actually possess a "considerable number of Soviet-made weapons. As regards some types of military hardware, Soviet weapons perhaps account for the bulk of Iraq's military arsenal," he said.

At the same time, he recalled that Iraq had a large amount of weapons made in other countries, for instance, in Spain. "We act clearly and unambiguously in contacts with Iraqi representatives because, just as other countries, we are aware of the Soviet Union's great responsibility for having this crisis defused," Gremitskikh emphasised.

USSR on Arab 'Unification'

LD0908131790 Moscow TASS in English 1306 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—In connection of the "merging" of Iraq and Kuwait, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman was asked today about the Soviet position on the unification of Arab states.

The Soviet side presented its position on the "merging" between Iraq and Kuwait in the Foreign Ministry statement released today, Yuri Gremitskikh said.

However, "our position on the issue does not mean that the Soviet Union is negative about various unifications between Arab states, like in the case of the two Yemens," he said.

"This (unification) should not be done during an armed invasion, at the point of a gun, but on the basis of a genuine sovereign equality of the sides and free expression of people's will, in democratic and civilised forms," Gremitskikh said.

Soviet-PRC Border Talks

*LD0908150990 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT
9 Aug 90*

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—The Soviet-Chinese working group on border talks held a regular round of meetings in Moscow between July 26-August 9, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

He said the talks were held in a businesslike atmosphere, and the sides reached an understanding on several areas on the western part of the border. The work will continue.

On August 8, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, heading the Soviet delegation at the border talks, met Chinese and Soviet participants in the working group. They discussed Soviet-Chinese cooperation and further steps in the border settlement, the spokesman said.

PRC-Indonesia Relations

*LD0908165190 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT
9 Aug 90*

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh, at a briefing here today, welcomed the restoration of diplomatic relations between Indonesia and China, which were formalised by the signing of a memorandum during Chinese State Council Premier Li Peng's visit to Jakarta.

The normalisation of relations between these two large Asian states, with which the Soviet Union maintains friendly contacts, reflects positive tendencies that have been gathering momentum in the Asia-Pacific region and in the world as a whole recently, Gremitskikh emphasised.

This will undoubtedly promote further stabilisation of relations, he added.

PRC's Position on Cambodia

*LD0908170990 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT
9 Aug 90*

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev:

A senior Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman described China's stance on the Cambodian settlement, which was set out by Chinese Premier Li Peng at a Jakarta news conference, as "a step in the right direction, which can open new prospects for advancing towards a comprehensive settlement in Cambodia."

At a briefing here today, Gremitskikh singled out Li Peng's statement that he supports efforts aimed at talks with the participation of all warring factions in Cambodia and that China will never back up the Khmer Rouge's supremacy in power in that country.

Gremitskikh also quoted Li Peng as saying that it is impossible to achieve an end to the conflict by military means. He recalled that Li Peng favoured holding a regular round of consultations in Jakarta between the co-chairmen of the international conference on Cambodia, France and Indonesia, and representatives of the four Cambodian parties to reach an agreement on a political settlement.

U.S.-Vietnamese Contacts

*LD0908161190 Moscow TASS in English 1518 GMT
9 Aug 90*

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman today praised the beginning of direct contacts between the United States and Vietnam on Cambodia.

The talks, held recently in New York, discussed U.S. and Vietnamese approaches to Cambodian self-determination through general elections, the United Nations role and international guarantees for Cambodian neutrality.

"This gives rise to hopes that this dialogue will lead to more positive developments towards a Cambodian settlement," Yuriy Gremitskikh said.

Increased Afghan Rebel Activity

*LD0908165690 Moscow TASS in English 1628 GMT
9 Aug 90*

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—Speaking at a briefing today, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh drew the attention of journalists to recent increases in Afghan rebels' activity.

He referred to the opinion of political analysts, who associate this development with the reshuffling of the Pakistani Government and the sharp aggravation of the situation in the Persian Gulf area. Gremitskikh said that the rebels "obviously regard the present moment as opportune to try to turn matters towards a military solution to intra-Afghan problems."

"All this once again reveals the real aspect of the rebels' politics and practical actions," the Soviet diplomat emphasised.

"The personal political ambitions of Afghan rebel leaders and their desire to play the role of chieftains of

various groups and to continue to batten on the fratricidal war are being placed above the possibilities of advance to national reconciliation.

"Reconciliation is emerging due to the flexible policy of the political leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan and due to the fact that the positions of countries, on which the solution of appropriate external aspects of Afghan settlement depends, are drawing closer together," Gremitskikh said.

Thatcher's Remarks on Europe

LD0908170390 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—A speech by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher made in Aspen, Colorado, on August 5, reflects a radical turn in the West's attitude about the future European organisation. It calls for a joint European peoples movement towards an epoch of free, democratic, civilised and equal cooperation, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

He said Soviet political circles welcomed Thatcher's ideas on ways to form a just and open Europe, which would be based on voluntary cooperation between states, economic freedom, the creative initiative of people and high involvement in the world. Such an approach meets our view of European and world processes, Gremitskikh said.

The spokesman said the Soviet Union is interested in Thatcher's proposals on the evolution of the European Communities towards equal opportunities for all European states, with due account of their diversity, traditions and national uniqueness.

The British leader's conviction and consistency when she speaks of the need to help the Soviet Union in the effective transition of its economy to up-to-date market mechanisms, inspire respect, he said.

A number of specific ideas on forms and directions of such assistance voiced by the prime minister might become the basis for bilateral and multilateral expert elaboration, Gremitskikh said.

The spokesman noted the coincidence of the Soviet and British approaches to resolving global problems faced by civilisation, such as the ecology, drugs, terrorism and health. "The Soviet Union shares the opinion that the time has come for decisive joint actions by the international community in these directions," Gremitskikh said.

Speaking about Thatcher's remarks concerning security problems, Gremitskikh said "This was, maybe, the first speech by the British prime minister in which she did not praise nuclear weapons." At the same time, she again

spoke of NATO peace-making role as a basis of European security. "The Soviet Union welcomes the statement as long as it does not contradict the NATO London declaration," Gremitskikh said.

UN Council for Iraq Sanctions Begins Work

LD1008081590 Moscow TASS in English 0725 GMT
10 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] United Nations August 10 TASS—The first meeting of the UN Security Council committee on the implementation of economic sanctions against Iraq was held at UN Headquarters in New York on Thursday [9 August].

The meeting elected governing bodies of the committee. Marjatta Rasi, deputy permanent representative of Finland to the United Nations, will head the committee. Canadian and Colombian representatives were elected committee deputy chairmen.

British Ambassador to the UN Crispin Tickell told journalists that the meeting also approved the committee's action programme.

The committee will collect information about sanctions against Iraq adopted by various countries and will define what additional measures the international community should take.

Some countries are now requesting explanations of Security Council Resolution 661 on sanctions. This will also be done by the committee, Tickell noted.

U.S. Ambassador to the UN Thomas Pickering said that UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar would receive reports from all countries by August 24 on what sanctions they had adopted.

The Security Council committee will then examine these reports and define what additional measures should be taken to raise the efficiency of sanctions.

The Iraqi representative said at the meeting of the Security Council on Thursday, when the annexation of Kuwait was deemed invalid, that Iraq does not intend to fulfil Security Council decisions.

These sanctions should have a sobering effect on Saddam Husayn, Pickering noted.

Commentator Praises Sino-Indonesian Relations

OW1008015390 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0100 GMT 8 Aug 90

[Text] A grand ceremony for restoring the diplomatic relations between Indonesia and China will be held in Jakarta on Wednesday. Visiting Chinese Premier Li Peng will attend the ceremony. The following is a commentary by Vladimirov, an observer of this station:

The restoration of normal relations between China and Indonesia is an important event in the Asian-Pacific region. Now, the 23-year ideological confrontation has finally come to an end, making it possible for Jakarta and Beijing to hold direct dialogue on issues in the Asian-Pacific region.

The leaders of the two countries have said that to expand contacts between Indonesia and China will stabilize further the situation in Asia. Their remarks are not unfounded, if we consider the fact that both countries have something to do with Cambodia, one of the biggest hot spots in the Asian-Pacific region. As everyone knows, Beijing all along has been supporting the Khmer Rouge, the most powerful and belligerent opposition faction in Cambodia; while Indonesia is a country that plays a key role in mediating the Cambodian issue. Representatives of all rival Cambodian forces were invited to attend an informal meeting in Jakarta three years ago.

While the Cambodian situation remains very complex, direct dialogue between Indonesian and Chinese leaders will help accelerate the process of mediating this conflict in Southeast Asia. One of the topics discussed by Indonesian and Chinese diplomats was the question of forces' equilibrium in the Asian-Pacific region. There is a tendency to call for reducing the Soviet and U.S. military presence in the region. Although Washington says that its forces will stay to ensure security in Asia, Indonesia and other ASEAN nations worry that a third country will come to fill the strategic vacuum created by Soviet-U.S. detente, and to take advantage of the new situation to serve its own interests. The development of Jakarta-Beijing relations will help eliminate such misgivings.

Indonesian President Suharto's visit to Moscow in 1989 has led to an expansion of Soviet-Indonesian cooperation. During his visit to Beijing last year, Gorbachev and Chinese leaders announced the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. Li Peng's current visit to Jakarta is significant, because it has formed the third side of this special triangle and completed the triangle. In the past, very intense debates took place among the three sides of this triangle. Today, the leaders of all three countries have said that it is necessary to establish international relations on the basis of new political thinking, the five principles of peaceful coexistence, and the ten principles of the Bandung Conference. This means that old dogmas and superstitions gradually are being replaced by healthy thinking and pragmatism.

In conclusion, our observer Vladimirov pointed out: This fact is praiseworthy.

Spain Permits U.S. To Use Bases for Airlift

*LD0908120390 Moscow TASS in English 1145 GMT
9 Aug 90*

[Text] Madrid August 9 TASS—Spain has given the United States permission to use U.S. bases on its territory to airlift troops to Saudi Arabia. The move comes as warships head towards the Gulf, to ward off the threat of an Iraqi invasion of Saudi Arabia.

Spanish Foreign Minister Francisco Fernandez Ordenez told a news conference here on Wednesday that this decision had been taken after an urgent meeting of Prime Minister Felipe Gonzales with the Cabinet.

This is the first time Spain has permitted the United States to use bases on its territory for operations in the Middle East.

Spanish Radio reports intensified activity at U.S. bases in Spain on Wednesday.

Portugal Permits U.S. Use of Air Bases

*LD0908143890 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT
9 Aug 90*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Reshetilov]

[Text] Lisbon August 9 TASS—The Portuguese Government has complied with the use of the Lajes Air Base on the Azores and the passage of U.S. combat aircraft through Portuguese air space towards the Gulf, if need be.

The LUSA News Agency reports that six U.S. refuelling planes took off from the Lajes base on Wednesday. They are usually used for the mid-air refuelling of fighters.

The LUSA agency notes that if the situation in the Gulf deteriorates even more, NATO armed forces may also use the Beja Air Base inside Portuguese territory, where West German military pilots train.

The Madeira regional government announced that it would place all its airports at the disposal of Western countries, apart from the overloaded Porto Santo airport, to settle the Gulf crisis.

United States & Canada

U.S. Naval Squadron To Visit Vladivostok

LD0908220690 Moscow TASS in English 2036 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolyov]

[Text] Washington 9 August (TASS)—A U.S. naval squadron will pay a friendly visit to the Soviet Union soon.

Three U.S. Navy ships will arrive in Vladivostok on 10 September for a four-day visit, Pentagon official spokesman Pete Williams said. The squadron will be led by Admiral Charles Larson, commander-in-chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet.

The visit will be made under the exchange programme between the United States and the Soviet Union, called upon primarily to improve relations between the navies of the two countries, the spokesman said.

The visit will be in reply to the call at San Diego, California, by three Soviet ships under the flag of Admiral G.A. Khvatov, commander of the Pacific Fleet. The Soviet naval squadron's visit ended last week.

U.S. Consul in Leningrad Tours Lithuania

LD0808203790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1900 GMT 8 Aug 90

[Text] The consul of the U.S. Consulate in Leningrad, James Hatcheson, and his wife visited Lithuania from 5 to 8 August. He was received by Supreme Council Deputy Chairman Bronislavas Kuzmickas. Talks took place with deputies Arunas Degutis and Algirdas Kumza. Together with Lithuanian radio and television officials the possibility of the retransmission to Lithuania of some U.S. broadcasts were discussed. At the Academic Drama Theater opinions were exchanged on cultural cooperation.

Canadian Defense Chief Gives News Briefing

LD0808164990 Moscow Television Service
in Russian 1430 GMT 8 Aug 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] General de Chastelain, chief of the Defense Staff of Canada, is staying in our country at the invitation of Army General Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

Noting that this is the first visit in history to the USSR of a Canadian commander of such high rank, Gen. de Chastelain stressed during a news conference in Moscow the growing mutual understanding and cooperation between our countries in all areas.

Canada and the Soviet Union have much in common. We can learn a lot from each other and share a lot with

each other, declared the Canadian chief of Defense Staff. To be honest, I cannot say that during my military service Canada had any obvious enemies. The real situation which came about in Europe and the North Atlantic after the Second World War forced us to consider the USSR and the countries of the Warsaw Pact Organization as potential enemies. However, we had no real enemies. Nevertheless, in the unstable and quickly changing world of the nineties we have a potential enemy: The main threat to all of us, apart from poverty, disease, and destruction of the environment, is international instability caused by countries on the brink of conflict between themselves. While eliminating the differences which separated the alliances which formed in East and West, we must maintain vigilance in order to ensure not only the security of each of our countries, but also the possibility of settling any conflict wherever and whenever it arises. Today the Canadian guest continues familiarizing himself with our country and with the Armed Forces of the USSR.

China

Ministry Welcomes Chinese-Indonesian Ties

OW0908154590 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 1400 GMT 8 Aug 90

[Text] While Chinese Premier Li Peng is making an official goodwill visit in Indonesia, the two sides will sign an agreement in Jakarta on 8 August on restoring the diplomatic relations between the two countries which was severed in 1967. A great deal of preparatory work was done by both sides before making this decision. During their talks in Beijing in early July this year, Chinese and Indonesian foreign ministers reached a final agreement based on the principles of the historic Bandung declaration, such as peaceful coexistence, mutual respect for each other's sovereignty, equality, and mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Our reporter (Chirnov) called on (Lajibrinski), a Southeast Asia expert of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, and asked him to comment on the event.

The Foreign Ministry expert says: The Soviet Union welcomes this development. The restoration of diplomatic relations between China and Indonesia is a result of enhanced trust among various countries and the elimination of ideological factors in international relations. This causes people to conclude that the policy of interference in each other's internal affairs—a policy that caused the severance of diplomatic relations—has become a thing of the past. Now, trust is being restored and cooperation is developing daily; enemies have disappeared, and only partners exist. This development of relations is conducive to stabilizing the situation. We in Moscow are also glad about it.

Concerning the effect the normalization of the Sino-Indonesian relations will have on the situation in the region, he says: First, it becomes easier to settle regional issues, such as the Cambodian issue. It is easier for

countries with normal relations and mutual trust to find a common language in the course of settling regional issues.

In conclusion, the Foreign Ministry expert says: In this important region in the world, many things will depend on what China and Indonesia do.

Renewed Sino-Indonesian Ties Viewed

LD0908203590 Moscow TASS in English 2015 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS news analyst Askold Biryutkov]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—The restoration of diplomatic relations between China and Indonesia is fresh evidence of the indisputable fact that positive processes are developing in the Asia-Pacific region as well.

They reflect people's rising hopes for peace and stability, their desire to do away with confrontation as soon as possible and commit all resources to overcoming existing problems and improving life.

The two countries' foreign ministers signed a memorandum in Jakarta on August 8, proclaiming the normalisation of relations between them on the basis of the principles recorded in the historic Bandung declaration 35 years ago.

The unfreezing of relations between the largest state on the Asian continent and the influential member of the Association of the Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), that had been chilly for 23 years, on a new, healthy foundation undoubtedly opens wide prospects for developing relations between them in the political trade, economic and other areas.

It should also make a tangible contribution to detente, to the efforts to promote peace and stability and develop mutually beneficial cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region and all over the world.

The end of the confrontation between China and Indonesia shows that "the process of detente and dialogue is gradually spreading to the Asian Continent," wrote the Japanese ASAHI SHIMBUN.

Indonesian politician Ruslan Abdulgani noted in this regard that the restoration of relations between China and Indonesia would allow political stability to be ensured in Asia and will also open the way towards a peaceful settlement in Cambodia.

These forecasts were reaffirmed by a Jakarta news conference, at which Chinese Premier Li Peng said that China was prepared to contribute towards achieving an early political settlement in Cambodia. Li Peng said China would also help create a supreme national council involving all Cambodian parties.

Importantly, Li Peng emphasised that China would not provide military aid to the Cambodian opposition

groups, including the Khmer Rouge, if other countries withdrew weapons shipments to the warring parties. "The 11-year-old conflict showed that neither side can achieve victory on the battlefield," Li Peng noted.

Indonesia's call to China to use its influence to convince the Cambodian opposition, including the Khmer Rouge, to search for a solution to the problem through talks rather than militarily was received positively by the Chinese side.

On the order of the day is the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and Singapore. This issue will be central to talks between Li Peng and the Singaporean leaders.

Joint Economic, Trade Commission With China Meets

OW1008034090 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia
1100 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] We have reported that the Soviet-Chinese Intergovernmental Economic, Trade, Scientific, and Technological Cooperation Commission held its fifth meeting in Beijing recently. Both sides summed up the development of bilateral relations in 1989 and drew up measures for implementing the agreement concluded during Chinese Premier Li Peng's visit to the USSR. In a commentary our station economic observer Andreyev comments on the meeting in detail:

I would like to first talk about the formation of the Soviet-Chinese Intergovernmental Economic, Trade, Scientific, and Technological Cooperation Commission. Both sides decided to form this commission in (?1986). The first meeting of the commission was held in Beijing. The commission has held a meeting alternately in Moscow and Beijing once a year since its first meeting.

Following the development of Soviet-Chinese relations, the tasks of this coordinating organization have increased and have become complex. As a result, the commission has formed a work group for planning cooperation in the fields of transport, education, and energy, a border and local affairs liaison work group, and a scientific and technological subcommittee. Another subcommittee on consumer goods was formed this year.

The third meeting of the commission was held in 1988. An entirely new agreement on bilateral economic relations was concluded during the meeting. The agreement outlined the basic principles for the establishment and development of economic and trade relations, as well as the creation of joint ventures between the Soviet republics, departments of the Soviet Government, and Soviet enterprises on the one hand and Chinese provinces, autonomous regions, and cities on the other. It was this agreement which laid down the legal basis for direct cooperation between various organizations of the two countries. It is sufficient to cite an example. At present, 19 joint ventures have gone into operation. There are several Sino-Soviet joint ventures under construction in China. Most of the joint ventures formed in the past

have been restaurants. Recently, Soviet-Chinese joint ventures have expanded to the field of production and construction. For example, in the city of Arkhangelsk, a joint venture for the production of computers has been created between the Soviet Delta Cooperative and a Chinese company. The Leningrad Mining College and the China Coal Import-Export Company have formed a joint venture for the production of scientific instruments. Business representatives from Vladivostok and Harbin have set up a joint venture to manufacture clocks and watches, plastic products, and other consumer goods.

The basic task of the fifth meeting of the commission was to draw up specific measures for implementing the agreement concluded during Chinese Premier Li Peng's visit to the Soviet Union, that is, to draw up a long-term program for developing economic, scientific, and technological cooperation. During the meeting it was agreed that the Soviet and Chinese organizations concerned should conclude an agreement on various cooperative projects as soon as possible within the scope of this program. The meeting also agreed on cooperation in agriculture, lumbering, (lumber) processing, and necessary measures to protect forests. The meeting gave priority to cooperation in the fields of consumer goods production and aviation. The meeting agreed that settling accounts will be based on the use of foreign exchange beginning 1 January 1991. It also focused on discussing the future of bilateral economic relations.

The next meeting—that is, the sixth meeting—of the commission will be held in Moscow in the second quarter in 1991.

Chinese Scientific, Technical Exhibit Opens 2 Aug

PM0708172590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Aug 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent T. Yesilbayev under the "Marked 'Topical'" rubric: "Facets of Cooperation"]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 1 Aug—Microelectronics, duplicating equipment, samples of light industry goods and other consumer goods, medical preparations, and food production technology—that is an incomplete list of the exhibits (there are roughly 370 of them) at the scientific and technical exhibition from China's Xinjiang-Uighur Autonomous Area, which has opened for the first time at the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Exhibition of National Economic Achievements.

Its organizers—the Xinjiang-Uighur Autonomous Area Committee for Science and Technology and the Kazakh Gosplan [State Planning Commission]—are pursuing business aims. Scientists, leaders of, and specialists from various republic ministries and departments who have familiarized themselves with the goods produced by enterprises in the Xinjiang-Uighur Autonomous Area can establish direct ties and conclude contracts with them.

"We already have experience of this kind," said Ye. Selitskiy, chief of the Kazakh SSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] Combined Scientific and Technical Progress Department.

"For instance, specialists from the republic's Academy of Sciences Institute of Geological Sciences are now working in Xinjiang-Uighur Autonomous Area. They are conducting scientific studies with their Chinese colleagues. Ties are developing vigorously between scientists from a number of other academic institutes and similar scientific establishments in Xinjiang-Uighur Autonomous Area. We have things to learn from one another. The theme of the current exhibition—'Friendship, Cooperation, Progress'—accords with the aspirations of the Soviet and Chinese peoples."

Conflict With Chinese Auto Workers Reported

OW1008122090 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0200 GMT 10 Aug 90

[Text] Soviet KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA of 8 August carried a report by its reporter on an incident that occurred on 1 August in a Chinese worker's dormitory in the city of (Gorkiy). The report said that the Chinese workers threw various articles out of their dormitory windows in an attempt to damage a police patrol car below. Later, they walked out of the dormitory building, trying to pursue the car and seize weapons from the police. It was not until a shot was fired to the air did the drive to attack the police cool down, said the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reporter. According to the report, the conflict stemmed from the detention of a Chinese worker who beat up a policeman on the street.

Our station's reporter (Gerisov) inquired about the incident in an interview with a leader of the (Gorkiy) Automobile Plant, which employs the Chinese workers. (Volunin), deputy director of the (Gorkiy) Automobile Plant, said: Our automobile plant is one of the largest enterprises in our country. In some workshops, there are Chinese workers. [words indistinct] Now, there are 800 Chinese workers in (Gorkiy) City. According to the contract terms, another 200 Chinese workers will come to (Gorkiy) City. They are all young workers under 25 years old and are engaged in (?casting) work, which does not require special training. Their monthly wage is 220 roubles, almost equal to the average wage of a Soviet worker. The Chinese workers live in completely equipped quarters with its own hot water supply and heaters. Each unit has a refrigerator provided by the plant. At the workplace, the Chinese workers can eat hot meals. There is also a cafeteria in the dormitory.

(Volunin) continued: Generally speaking, we are satisfied with the Chinese workers' production work and labor discipline. Actually, several hundreds of them are doing a very good job. However, about 100 of them have often violated labor discipline and the code of conduct while at public places. At times, some of them have refused to come to work and have frequently fought with each other. In the dormitory, they have committed

hooliganism and damaged equipment. We have taken the necessary measures against these serious discipline violators. We have discontinued contracts with 70 of the Chinese workers, who will be sent back to China.

In conclusion, (Volunin), deputy director of the (Gorkiy) Automobile Plant, said: The incident reported by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA did occur. It was a regretful matter. To be fair, I wish to point out that serious conflicts between the Chinese workers and police are not frequent. While working in (Gorkiy) City, only a few of them were detained on charges of hooliganism or selling goods at places not designated for such purposes. We firmly believe that with the assistance from the Chinese side, it will be possible to maintain good order and completely execute the terms of the contracts.

In addition, our reporter (Gerisov) asked the Chinese Embassy to comment on the incident in (Gorkiy) City. (Yang Kerong), press officer of the Chinese Embassy, said: At the present time, we are not fully aware of the incident. Currently, we are trying, through our own channels, to acquire the details of the incident in (Gorkiy) City involving Chinese workers. We believe the vast majority of the Chinese workers in Soviet enterprises abide by Soviet law and are ready to conduct effective cooperation with the Soviet workers.

Concluding his remarks, (Yang Kerong) said: We appreciate the (Uruz) Broadcasting Station's comment that it is necessary to hear opinions from all sides and to get an understanding of the objective situation.

Mikhaylov, a special reporter of the Chinese-Language Editorial Department of the Moscow Radio Station, has set out to (Gorkiy) City. We are awaiting his detailed report.

Northeast Asia

Restructured Economic Ties With DPRK Urged

PM0808104190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Aug 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by N. Bahanova, candidate of economic sciences: "No Older or Younger Brothers. On Certain Aspects of USSR-DPRK Trade and Economic Cooperation"]

[Text] The Soviet Union always was and will remain a highly important trading partner for North Korea. During the first few years after World War II the USSR provided 90 percent of the republic's imports, supplying it with highly essential goods—ranging from automobiles to food products. Now roughly half of North Korean commodity turnover with the outside world is with our country.

The Soviet Union in turn receives valuable raw materials—zinc, lead, cadmium, magnesite clinker, and so on—from the DPRK. Admittedly, let us be frank and say that Korean contracting parties have not always been

meticulous in fulfilling their obligations. They sometimes fail to supply the USSR with commodities that can be sold in the West for freely convertible currency. As a result the DPRK has a chronic trade deficit with the Soviet Union. Moreover, its debts are generally deferred or simply written off.

The scale of the technical aid that the Soviet Union offers its Far Eastern neighbor is impressive. More than 70 facilities producing more than one-fourth of the DPRK's gross industrial output, including 63 percent of its electricity, 50 percent of its coal and petroleum products, 33 percent of its steel, and some of its rolled ferrous metal, chemical fertilizers, cast iron, and so on, have been constructed in the northern part of the Korean peninsula with our aid. No more than 30 percent of the funds allocated by Moscow for technical aid to Pyongyang is recouped. The DPRK has been given roughly 300 million rubles for free.

The following question is reasonable: What occasioned this generosity? The point is that Moscow regarded Pyongyang as an important bastion of our interests in the Far East amid global ideological and military-political confrontation with the West. The Soviet leadership did not begrudge money or material and manpower resources to ensure its neighbors' survival and loyalty.

The DPRK stuck its ground, but, regrettably, lost the economic competition with South Korea. The South is appreciably ahead of the North in terms of its per capita GNP, exports, industrial growth rates, and solvency.

The Soviet Union undoubtedly bears blame—and considerable blame at that—for the DPRK's problems. Let us recall that the administrative-edict system of economic management—the republic's main scourge—developed on Korean soil at Moscow's bidding, on Soviet lines. Everything that could be has been "squeezed" out of that system. Its innate defects still bind the republic's productive forces hand and foot. The USSR has, of course, not only ceased to impose the old methods on its Far Eastern friend but is itself abandoning them. But the system has struck deep roots in people's Korea and is being retained by the Korean leadership's own choice.

However, that is not the only reason for the republic's backwardness, despite the years-long massive aid from the USSR and other socialist countries. The fallacious quantitative approach geared to expanding capital construction rather than to mastering intensive factors for development, above all state-of-the-art technology, was invariably applied when planning cooperation. The structure of technical aid was not noted for its rationality: Almost 60 percent of the funds were spent on power engineering and ferrous metallurgy, while only 10 percent was spent on machine building and three percent on light industry. Thus, USSR-DPRK cooperation had little to do with the implementation of the main goal of socialism—increasing the working people's standard of living.

Many facilities were constructed without taking strict account of the material, technical, and manpower resources needed to assimilate them. The result was that plants and factories stood idle owing to a shortage of electricity, raw materials, and manpower. The North Korean authorities must also share the blame for this with the Soviet Union. After all, it was they who insisted on constructing what were "prestigious" but known to be unviable enterprises.

Thus, instead of directing its efforts into organizing export sectors, Soviet aid was for a long time in many respects used to develop import-substitute production processes. The fact that the existing mechanism for cooperation does not ensure Soviet organizations' interest in ensuring facilities' uninterrupted working of facilities following their commissioning or in technical renewal is also of no small importance. In turn the Koreans lack economic incentives to properly assimilate Soviet credits and equipment.

People in Pyongyang have never, incidentally, been totally satisfied with Soviet aid. There have been complaints of Soviet attempts to foist "unacceptable experience" on its partner and "subject it to political control," complaints of shipments of obsolete and hyperexpensive equipment from the Soviet Union, and complaints of procurements of Korean goods at reduced prices.

How can Soviet-Korean cooperation be rendered effective? I think that a new foundation—the radical restructuring of both countries' economic mechanisms—is above all needed for this. This has already started in the Soviet Union, but not in North Korea. Both our and the North Korean economy are still not very receptive to scientific and technical progress and rational use of resources. It is also important to realize that however the Soviet Union tries to help its neighbor, it will be hard for the DPRK to resolve its problems as long as confrontation and the arms race persist on the Korean peninsula and as long as the republic is still effectively cut off from business contacts with most of the world's most developed countries.

However, under current conditions the return from cooperation can also be enhanced. We should begin by making cooperation mutually beneficial. It must not be a case of older and younger brothers, nor of one side magnanimously providing aid and the other meekly accepting. Relations of this kind invariably give rise to grievances and disputes.

But equality alone between partners is not enough. Mutual economic incentives for contacts are what is needed; and for this we need economic independence for the contracting parties, freedom in decisionmaking, and an opportunity to obtain and dispose of profits within reason.

With regard to trade, centralized forms of trade, in particular minute coordination at ministerial level of lists of goods, have indisputably had their day. Let the two countries' production and trading organizations,

including cooperatives, themselves find suitable partners and sought-after output, and reach agreement on conditions for deliveries of goods, and so on. Just as this is done throughout the civilized world. Of course, the transition to new conditions of commodity exchange will be painful. Losses, difficulties, and grievances are possible. But preserving and hanging onto the old forms means retarding economic progress in the USSR and the DPRK and is detrimental to both countries' long-term interests.

It is time to move on from technical aid determined by willful decisions from above to creating joint enterprises, involving interested economic organizations from the USSR and the DPRK. Why not enlist companies from South Korea, Japan, the PRC, and other countries in these kind of enterprises? They will find things to do. Take the exploitation of the natural resources of the USSR's eastern regions, which is being done badly at present.

It is easy to name dozens more avenues for new forms of economic interaction. But that is not the crux of the matter. The main thing is to free Soviet-Korean trade and economic ties from the chains of the administrative-edict system.

Preview of 26 Aug Elections in Mongolia Reported

*LD0908170490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0930 GMT 9 Aug 90*

[Report by Nikolay Agayants from the "International Diary" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Agayants] The date of the holding of repeat elections to the Great People's Hural of Mongolia has been set for 26 August. I will remind you that they will be held where, earlier, none of the candidates got the necessary number of votes. There are 34 such constituencies. As a MONTSAME correspondent reported from Ulaanbaatar, the preliminary selection of two candidate deputies for the Great People's Hural in all constituencies where three or more candidates have been submitted will be held on 15 August. It is planned to hold preelection meetings with the candidates left as a result of this selection on 16-25 August.

We will continue our discussion on Mongolia where, to be frank, ambiguous processes are now taking place. Interest in this country has recently grown sharply. Alongside me in the studio is my colleague, All-Union Radio's foreign policy commentator Sergey Pravdin, and I ask him to speak in detail about the situation in the Mongolian People's Republic after the elections held there, which the press has described as nothing other than the first free and multi-candidate ones in almost 70 years. But, the first question is not about the elections. Tell us, Sergey Yevgeniyevich, how and why was the 828th anniversary of the birth of Genghis Khan recently marked so ceremoniously in Mongolia?

[Pravdin] The date is not a clear-cut one, as they say. But, it really was widely celebrated. After all, Genghis Khan is perhaps the most notable figure in the history of this ancient country, an ambiguous figure of course. On the one hand a conqueror, and indeed a cruel conqueror, yet on the other, the founder of the single Mongolian state. The Mongolian press is now writing a great deal about that distant time and films are being made on this topic, while in the center of Ulaanbaatar the floors of one of the country's major new hotels, which Yugoslav specialist are decorating, are rising. It already has a name: Genghis Khan. Incidentally, he was widely known and (Temudzhin).

[Agayants] But, now let us return to the elections. Tell us, could the opposition win?

[Pravdin] First of all, let's clarify one thing. The Mongolian press is not calling the new parties opposition parties. And they themselves are not describing themselves in this way. Yes, they criticize the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP], which has been ruling the country since the revolution in 1921, and at times criticize it very sharply, but the leaders of the new parties have stated on more than one occasion that they are ready to cooperate with all the nation's healthy forces with the aim of overcoming the present economic crisis. But, of course, they were unable to win in these elections. After all, they were created one and a half or two months ago. Victory was predicted for the MPRP and it achieved this, but the new parties achieved undoubted success.

[Agayants] And what are their leaders like?

[Pravdin] They are all very young. Not one of them is older than 35 years old. They have received higher education in our country. Some of them have bachelor's degrees. You know, I liked them. In Mongolia they are regarded as a real political force, although now of course, the new parties cannot be compared, both in numerical strength and in terms of organization with the MPRP.

[Agayants] But the ruling party too has a new leadership now.

[Pravdin] The former Politburo, as is known, retired en masse, as did the government. Incidentally, leaders of the trade unions, Revsomol, and women's organizations also retired. There are many new people in the MPRP and in other political and public organizations of Mongolia.

[Agayants] But, previously, the Mongolian press, following our own of course, harped on how Mongolia had made gigantic leap in its development and stepped from feudalism straight into socialism.

[Pravdin] The successes of the Mongolian people are incontestable and no one is writing them off, but the MPRP had both a cult of personality and a period of stagnation. The party also made mistakes. After all, in its fundamental aspects the contemporary history of Mongolia is remarkably similar to that of our own country

and this is no coincidence. For almost seven decades Mongolia received progressive Soviet experience as we used to say before. Now, the country is building a humane, democratic society.

[Agayants] The changes in Mongolia in the political sphere are very notable, but how are things with the economy, Sergey Yevgeniyevich?

[Pravdin] In the economy, the successes are of course more modest. What is needed is time. The MPRP has proclaimed a new economic policy and has adopted a law on foreign investments which is far more radical by comparison with analogous legislation in the countries of East Europe, not to speak of our own country. For example, it permits the investment of foreign capital in all industrial sectors without exception, just as it also allows the exportation of profits. Now, not only Japan but also the so-called young industrial tigers of Asia—South Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore, and other countries—are showing great interest in economic cooperation with Mongolia. And one has to presume that the restructuring of the Mongolian economy will also be successful. From 1 January next year, it is planned to try out the mechanism of market relations in Mongolia.

Russian Prime Minister Meets With Japanese Envoy

LD0908215290 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT
9 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—Russia's Prime Minister Ivan Silayev today met Sumio Edamura, Japanese ambassador to the Soviet Union.

During a friendly conversation the two sides exchanged views on prospects for the development of Russo-Japanese relations.

Japanese Peace Group To Aid Chernobyl Victims

LD1008125390 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT
10 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 10 TASS—Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, chairman of the government commission overseeing the clean-up of the Chernobyl nuclear accident received on Thursday Sasakawa Yohei, chairman of the fund to promote the Japanese shipping industry, with a group of Japanese medical experts.

They discussed how the Sasakawa peace fund could help give practical assistance to the Soviet Union in treating the victims of the Chernobyl accident.

The conversation was held in a business-like and friendly atmosphere.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S. Change on Cambodia Termed 'Good News'

BK1008093590 *Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia*
1100 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Commentary by station observer (Yevgeniy Belov)]

[Text] The Soviet Union and the United States lately have spared a lot of attention to solving regional conflicts. One such conflict is the Cambodian issue. Our observer, Comrade (Yevgeniy Belov), comments:

The solution to the Cambodian problem certainly got a lot of attention at the meeting in Irkutsk between the Soviet and U.S. chiefs of foreign affairs. The discussion in depth of this chronic conflict was determined by two events: the fairly good improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations in the past few years and the U.S. shift on solving the Cambodian problem.

The United States announced recently that it no longer supports the tripartite Cambodian alliance to represent Cambodia in the United Nations as long as the Khmer Rouge group is still part of the alliance. I would like to recall that since 1979, the United States has recognized not the legitimate government in Phnom Penh but the so-called coalition government led by Samdech Siha-nouk which also includes representatives of the Khmer Rouge and former Cambodian Prime Minister Son Sann. It is the coalition government which has been receiving from the United States vast amounts of financial and military assistance.

By changing its attitude toward the coalition government, the United States has made an important step ahead to set up a strong obstacle to prevent the return to power of the Pol Pot group—the group which has brought countless suffering to the Cambodian people. As for the Soviet Union, it has always adhered to a position of supporting the legitimate government in Phnom Penh—the government which has been putting forward proposals to solve the Cambodian problem politically. Our Soviet Union has been doing everything to restore peace in Cambodia to prevent the country from falling again into the dark era under the genocidal regime.

On this extremely important issue, the Soviet Union and the United States are adhering to an increasingly close position. This has become good news for bringing a Cambodian solution closer along with the news on the first round of direct talks between the United States and Vietnam. At these talks, the two sides discussed the right to self-determination of the Cambodian people through just and correct general elections to restore peace and prevent the Pol Pot regime from returning to power in the country.

It is most welcome that the U.S.-Vietnamese talks were held in a constructive atmosphere and have become a good starting point on the path to increase mutual understanding between the two countries. All this creates

a positive circumstance; it provides a fair improvement to the situation around Cambodia and also creates new and numerous possibilities for resolutely moving forward for a solution to the Cambodian problem. It will undeniably serve to strengthen peace and security in the region as a whole, concludes our observer, Comrade (Yevgeniy Belov).

Near East & South Asia

TASS Presents Ministry's Statement on Gulf

LD0908134590 *Moscow TASS in English* 1332 GMT
9 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskiikh today read out the following statement by the USSR Foreign Ministry:

The situation in the Gulf is becoming more dramatic.

After the invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi troops on August 2, serious events took place in the area, including the so-called "merger" of Iraq and Kuwait, announced on Wednesday, and the deployment of U.S. naval and air forces in Saudi Arabia, which Washington claims, are to protect Saudi Arabia's interests.

The tendency towards an escalation of confrontation and passions is unfortunately gathering strength.

The course of events generates concern and worry in Moscow, inasmuch as it takes place in a region where there is already a surfeit of "explosive material"—old conflicts, long-standing resentments and mutual territorial claims.

At the same time the region is a centre of important political and economic interests of many states, including the Soviet Union.

As a result, from the very beginning of the Gulf crisis caused by the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, we firmly and clearly said that the spreading fire should be extinguished as soon as possible, the situation which existed before August 2 be restored and the sides sit at the negotiating table to settle outstanding issues peacefully.

In addition to efforts within the Security Council, we were engaged in contacts with the Iraqi leadership, including the exchange of messages at the level of the Soviet and Iraqi presidents to channel events in this direction.

This exchange of views with the Iraqi side prompted hopes that matters would move towards implementing Resolution 660 of the Security Council and thereby quickly defuse the crisis.

Unfortunately we are obliged to recognise that our hopes have not been justified. Iraq has not only failed to withdraw its forces from Kuwait but yesterday declared what amounted to its annexation of the country.

It is difficult and painful for us to thus assess the latest actions by Iraq, a country with which we are linked by long-standing and friendly relations. We would like to preserve this friendship.

But in the present situation we cannot remain silent, let alone tell lies. Our approach to this question of principle remains firm: Sovereignty, national independence and territorial integrity of the State of Kuwait should be fully restored and protected.

The relevant resolutions of the U.N. Security Council demand the same actions.

Current events in the Gulf graphically show how important it is to display wisdom and circumspection under such circumstances and to prevent actions that may pour oil on the flames.

We would like to note again that the Soviet Union opposes force and unilateral decisions. The experience of many years shows that the most correct and sensible way of acting in conflict situations is through collective efforts and the utmost use of U.N. mechanisms.

On a specific plane, we are for the Security Council to tackle this most urgent issue now, on a permanent basis. We are also prepared for immediate consultations within the framework of the U.N. Security Council's military staff committee, which according to the U.N. Charter can perform very important functions.

Efforts by Arab countries themselves, as we see it, can play a special role in preventing the current situation in the Persian Gulf from developing into a larger-scale military conflict.

We are attentively studying reports on the Arab emergency summit meeting in Cairo. We hope that its results will become an important element of common action in view of the situation concerning Kuwait.

We would like to emphasise once again that the acuteness and the unpredictability of the current situation in the Persian Gulf area urgently require that all those directly involved in the dangerous confrontation unfolding there should show respect for the will of the international community and a sense of high responsibility for the destiny of peace.

Shevardnadze, Baker Confer on Gulf Situation

LD1008122390 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 10 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 10 (TASS)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today had a telephone talk with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker who is now in Brussels.

The subject of their talk was the situation in the Persian Gulf area.

Belonogov, Iranian Envoy Discuss Developments

LD1008112490 Moscow TASS in English 1117 GMT 10 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 10 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov today received Iranian Ambassador to the USSR Naser Heirani-Nobari at the latter's request.

The two men discussed the situation in the Gulf. Both sides expressed concern over dangerous developments.

Some issues of bilateral Soviet-Iranian relations were also raised.

General Predicts 'Reasonable' End to Situation

LD0908161090 Paris Antenne 2 Television in French 1100 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Interview with General Boris Gromov, Kiev District commander, by Moscow correspondent Jacques Merlino on 8 August; place of interview not given]

[Excerpt] [Merlino] Against a background of military maneuvers and exercises the Red Army received the international press yesterday. [video shows soldiers marching and training] The aim was to take stock of the problems in the Soviet Army, but very quickly one question dominated the meeting with General Gromov: Are you prepared to take part in an international force against Iraq? The reply was cautious:

[Begin Gromov recording] I think that the current situation in Iraq will end in a reasonable way; everything will go off well there because we have already heard some statements by Iraqi representatives, including military ones, saying that Iraq intended to withdraw its troops from Kuwait. [end recording] [passage omitted]

International Responses to Gulf Crisis Reported

U.S. President Gives Address

LD0808173790 Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 8 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov]

[Text] Washington August 8 TASS—President George Bush of the United States officially announced today the dispatch of U.S. troops to bases in Saudi Arabia in connection with the crisis in the Persian Gulf, which followed the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

In a televised address to the nation today, Bush said that he had sent elements of the 82nd Airborne Division and air force units, "who are arriving today to take up defensive positions in Saudi Arabia."

"I took this action to assist the Saudi Arabian Government in the defence of its homeland," Bush said.

"No one commits America's armed forces to a dangerous mission lightly, but after perhaps unparalleled international consultations and exhausting every alternative, it became necessary to take this action," he said.

"There is no justification whatsoever for this outrageous and brutal act of aggression. No one should underestimate our determination to confront aggression."

"Four simple principles guide our policy.

"First, we seek the immediate, unconditional and complete withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

"Second, Kuwait's legitimate government must be restored to replace the puppet regime.

"And third, my administration is committed to the security and stability of the Persian Gulf.

"And fourth, I am determined to protect the lives of American citizens abroad."

"The mission of our troops is wholly defensive, they will not initiate hostilities, but they will defend themselves," Bush said.

The mission may take a lot of time and money, but the imposed puppet regime is unacceptable, as is acquisition of territory by force, Bush said.

The United States took the decision after consulting leaders from the Middle East, Europe, Asia, the Americas and NATO, Bush said.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker consulted with his counterparts in many nations, including the Soviet Union.

"All agree that Iraq cannot be allowed to benefit from its invasion of Kuwait," Bush said.

The Iraqi aggression was condemned without dissent by the United Nations Security Council, which imposed sweeping sanctions against Iraq, he said.

"I pledge here today that the United States will do its part to see that these sanctions are effective and to induce Iraq to withdraw without delay from Kuwait."

"Let me be clear, the sovereign independence of Saudi Arabia is of vital interest to the United States."

The crisis in the Persian Gulf and the dispatch of American troops to the area may harm the delivery of Middle East oil to the United States, the president admitted.

He said he asked oil producing countries to increase oil production to minimise any impact that oil flow reductions will have on the world economy.

Secretary of State Baker heads for Europe today to consult with president Ozal of Turkey and the NATO foreign ministers, Bush said.

Western Nations Deploy Ships

PM0908174190 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 10 Aug 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by KRSNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Captain Third Class V. Maryukha: "'The Navy Is Prepared to Evacuate Our Countrymen...'"]

[Text] Persian Gulf—The tension that has arisen in the Persian Gulf has given a leading role to the navies of states interested in maintaining stability in the region. Escort duty and the protection of Soviet vessels in the Gulf region is being carried out by the crew of the large ASW [antisubmarine warfare] vessel "Admiral Tributs." KRSNAYA ZVEZDA's correspondent Captain Third Class V. Maryukha contacted the ship by radio. He spoke with Rear Admiral V. Zelenkov, who was on board. Here is what he said:

"Tension in the region is mounting. The eight U.S., two French, and two British ships have been joined by a USN aircraft carrier—the 'Independence'—which has taken up a combat position in the Gulf. The aircraft carrier 'Eisenhower' is also expected with six escort ships, and the number of French and British ships is expected to increase. The Saudi Arabian Navy has been put on combat alert and is carrying out intensified patrols along the country's maritime borders."

Our correspondent was informed by Rear Admiral A. Karlin, deputy chief of the Navy Political Directorate, that the Soviet naval seamen's task in the Persian Gulf remains the same—to safeguard the security of our shipping. By decision of the provisional Kuwaiti Government those foreign citizens, including Soviet citizens, who so wish can be evacuated. The Navy is prepared to evacuate our countrymen by sea, if tasked with this mission. The naval seamen have relevant experience. There are no plans for Soviet warships to take part in a naval blockade of the Iraqi coast or in armed action against Iraq.

UN Labels Annexation 'Void'

LD0908184890 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] United Nations August 9 TASS—The United Nations Security Council today declared Iraq's annexation of Kuwait to be null and void. The Council unanimously passed a resolution which says that "annexation of Kuwait by Iraq under any form and whatever pretext has no legal validity, and is considered null and void."

The resolution calls on all states, international organisations and specialised agencies not to recognise the annexation and to refrain from any actions or contacts that could be interpreted as indirect recognition of the annexation.

The Council urged Iraq to abandon its actions aimed at annexing Kuwait, and emphasised once again that Iraq should immediately and unconditionally withdraw its troops to the positions they held on August 1, 1990.

Representatives of the United States, France, Canada, Malaysia, Ethiopia, the Soviet Union, China, Finland and a number of other countries, in their remarks at the Council meeting, voiced serious concern over the deterioration of the situation in the Persian Gulf area, brought about by Iraq's actions.

Valentin Lozinskiy, first deputy permanent representative of the Soviet Union at the United Nations, suggested that the Security Council now tackle this most acute problem on a permanent basis.

He expressed the Soviet Union's readiness for immediate consultations within the framework of the Council's Military Staff Committee.

Crispin Tickell, permanent representative of Britain, likened the current situation to the dark pages of history in the 1930s when dictators used to seize one country after another, resorting to annexation and *anschlusses*. Only ten days ago one would have been incredulous about the possibility of this happening in our days, he said.

Speakers at the Council meeting emphasised the importance of Arab countries' efforts to settle the current crisis. They once again urged Iraq immediately and unconditionally to withdraw its troops from Kuwait.

U.S. Troops 'Flooding' Region

LD1008082890 Moscow TASS in English 0659 GMT
10 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington August 10 TASS—U.S. combat troops continue flooding into Saudi Arabia in an effort to prevent the Iraqi invasion of the country.

At least 2,300 U.S. servicemen were airlifted to Saudi Arabia at the initial stage of the U.S. "Desert Shield" operation. According to Pentagon spokesman Pete Williams, new troops of the 82nd Airborne Division, a component part of the Rapid Deployment Force, continued to arrive there on Thursday.

Press reports say that, after disembarking at the Saudi military base Dhahran, they are being dispatched to the border with Iraq. Joint military exercises with Saudi troops are being planned.

It was noted at a briefing in the Pentagon that all F-15 jets and five AWACS planes have arrived at their place of destination in Saudi Arabia.

Although the exact number of F-15s was not revealed, it is believed that two squadrons, about 46 fighters, were dispatched to Saudi Arabia from the U.S. Air Base in Langley, Virginia.

According to Williams, it will take several days or weeks to airlift U.S. troops and ammunition to deployment areas in Saudi Arabia.

Egypt's Mubarak Schedules Emergency Arab Summit

Iraq Presented With 'Ultimatum'

PM0908204990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Aug 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent D. Velikiy: "Egyptian Initiative"]

[Text] Cairo—Egyptian President Husni Mubarak has proposed holding a meeting of the heads of the Arab states in Cairo in 24 hours in order to try once more to put a stop to Iraqi aggression in Kuwait.

The Egyptian president's statement, which issued the Iraqi leadership with an ultimatum, says in particular that Cairo will examine the possibility of Egyptian troops' taking part in inter-Arab armed formations with a view to putting a stop to the aggression. H. Mubarak indicated that this is Iraq's last chance to settle the matter peacefully at a conference, where well-considered opinions rather than threats and blows will be exchanged.

If the aggression continues, the president said, Iraq will be dealt a crushing blow. However, H. Mubarak did not say what forces would inflict it. Observers point out in this connection that another U.S. aircraft carrier has passed through the Suez Canal. As for the Iraqi leader, the Egyptian president stressed that he has lost political trust after his treacherous attack on Kuwait, despite his frequent assurances of his peaceable intentions.

Local observers have noted during conversations with your correspondent that Iraq's aggression against its Kuwaiti neighbor is all the more painful for all Arabs in that it occurred after the Arab League's Baghdad summit, at which definite unity was thought to have been attained among them—this all happened against the backdrop of the optimistic prospects of peace following the end of the Iran-Iraq hostilities.

Local newspapers write that Iraq's announcement in the wake of the Egyptian initiative of the formation of a new state as a result of the merging of Iraq and Kuwait may be considered a preliminary response to this initiative. In this connection it seems that S. Husayn will hardly accept H. Mubarak's proposal, although it has met with broad support in the Arab world.

It must be said that the Kuwaiti tragedy has been taken very hard in Egypt. The Kuwaiti Embassy announced that roughly 30,000 of that country's citizens are now abroad, unable to return.

The Iraqi Embassy in Cairo has been cordoned off by troops in order to ensure its safety. Angry cries from demonstrators, a large number of whom have gathered

on adjacent streets, reach there: "Iraq! Hands off Kuwait!" They declaim this and other such slogans.

A state of emergency has been declared at Cairo International Airport owing to the need to deal in a short period with aircraft carrying tens of thousands of Egyptians, whose evacuation from Iraq and Kuwait is proceeding at full tilt.

THE EGYPTIAN GAZETTE—a progressive influential newspaper—reflects the drama of these events with the following words: "It would be no exaggeration to say that Husayn's military escapade has devastated the Arab homeland.... Unfortunately, Iraq's Goliath is a giant without a brain. Depriving a sovereign country of its freedom is an act of pure piracy. And there is no room for pirates in present-day society."

Iraqi Demands Delay Summit

LD1008084190 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT
10 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Malyarov]

[Text] Cairo August 10 TASS—The extraordinary Arab summit on the Gulf crisis was put off from Thursday to Friday because of differences among Arab leaders in their assessments of Iraq's actions.

MENA news agency reports that the Iraqi side advanced two conditions absolutely unacceptable to most Arabs. Iraq demanded that Colonel 'Ala' Husayn 'Ali who headed the "provisional free government of Kuwait" and who was given the post of Iraqi deputy prime minister during the "merger" of Kuwait with Iraq, should participate in the meeting.

The Iraqi side also demands that the emir of Kuwait, Jabir al-Sabah, should not participate in the conference.

Iraq believes that the main topic of the conference should be the planned U.S. attack on Iraq and the discussion of possible ways to oppose it. Reporters were told this by Iraqi First Deputy Prime Minister Taha Yasin Ramadan, head of the Iraqi delegation, who arrived in Cairo.

Nevertheless, local observers continue to hope that the conference will open in Cairo today. Large delegations from 19 Arab countries, 14 of them headed by top leaders, have already arrived in Cairo for the conference.

Intensive bilateral and tripartite unofficial consultations of Arab leaders were held in the Egyptian capital all through the night to work out a settlement.

Many believe that the most acceptable way out would be the withdrawal of all Iraqi troops from Kuwait on the basis of the United Nations and Arab League decisions, to be followed by negotiations between the lawful Kuwaiti Government headed by Jabir al-Sabah and Iraqi leaders headed by Saddam Husayn.

Gorbachev Sends Message

LD1008122190 Moscow TASS in English 1211 GMT
10 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 10 (TASS)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today sent a message to Egyptian President Husni Mubarak and the heads of other Arab states discussing events in the Gulf at the extraordinary summit in Cairo.

Baghdad Celebrates 'Annexation' of Kuwait

PM0908203590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Aug 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by NOVOSTI correspondent Ye. Mikitenko in Iraq for PRAVDA under the rubric "Near East: Stormclouds Over the Persian Gulf": "Baghdad Celebrates"]

[Text] Baghdad, 9 Aug—Late yesterday evening a stream of automobiles drove down one of Baghdad's main streets—al-Mansur—as if through a thick shroud of rain, although the stars were shining in the night sky. Mobs of Iraqi urchins showered each passing vehicle with water from bottles and buckets. This custom, which is a sign of a supreme joy among Iraqis, dates back to the times of ancient Babylon.

Over the last few days the local press has published a series of articles and studies on historical topics advancing the idea that Kuwait has been part of Iraq since time immemorial.

A festive firework display took place in Baghdad in connection with Kuwait's "annexation" to Iraq. The sky over the capital was illuminated by tracer fire deep into the night. Large demonstrations involving many thousands of people were held in support of the "unification" decision in many of Iraq's cities under the slogan "The Kuwaiti branch has returned to the primordial tree."

All Iraqi newspapers published a statement by a spokesman for Iraq's main military command claiming that Israel has gotten its aircraft ready for combat, equipping them with USAF insignia. According to reports, Israeli pilots have been issued with U.S. identity cards.

Kuwaiti Envoy Interviewed on Gulf Situation

Requests Increased Support

LD0908225890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2020 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Interview with Kuwaiti Ambassador to the USSR 'Abd-al-Mohsen al-Du'ayj by unidentified correspondent at the Kuwaiti Embassy in Moscow on 9 August—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mr. Ambassador, what prompted your statement today expressing no confidence in the new government of Kuwait?

[Al-Du'ayj] It is not a government, but a bunch of Iraqi officers—and the whole world knows that. Yesterday's announcement that Kuwait was being annexed confirms once again, if confirmation were needed, the nature of the Iraqi military. The most correct thing in it is that the government is called provisional. We also consider that this is a provision phenomenon, and cannot recognize this notorious government.

[Correspondent] Doesn't the statement pose a threat to you personally, for the staff of the embassy, and for their relatives now living in Kuwait?

[Al-Du'ayj] What happens to me is unimportant compared with what has happened to my country. From the invader you can expect anything, including the most uncivilized behavior. As for relatives, the whole Kuwaiti people are my relatives. Among them are those who have been killed or wounded, or made homeless. I am saying this not for the sake of your sympathy, but for the sake of your help. We ask you to redouble your efforts and take all measures to curb the aggressor. Our embassy's statement reaffirms our loyalty to the legitimate government led by the amir of Kuwait."

Conveys 'Gratitude' to Gorbachev

PM1008083390 Moscow TRUD in Russian
10 Aug 90 p 3

[Interview in Moscow 9 August with 'Abd-al-Mohsen al-Du'ayj, ambassador of the State of Kuwait to the USSR, by correspondent I. Belov: "'We Will Regain Freedom'"—first paragraph is an editorial introduction]

[Text] 'Abd-al-Mohsen Yusuf al-Du'ayj, 43 years old, has been representing his country in Moscow for four years. Previously he had worked in Kuwait's embassies in Saudi Arabia and the United States.

[Belov] Mr. Ambassador, how does the Kuwaiti leadership rate the Soviet-U.S. joint statement on the aggression by Iraqi troops against your country?

[Al-Du'ayj] We rate highly the Soviet Union's position. U.S. President George Bush has also rated highly the USSR's position on this question. Soviet-U.S. cooperation is very important under these conditions. We believe that the two great powers' honest and constructive cooperation will play a decisive role in liberating our motherland from the aggressor.

[Belov] Could you speak about the position of the legitimate government of Kuwait with regard to the so-called "free government" formed since the Iraqi troop invasion?

[Al-Du'ayj] Our position is unequivocal—only one legitimate government of Kuwait exists, headed by His Highness Amir Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Sabah. The so-called "free government" consists exclusively of Iraqi officers appointed and sent in with the tanks by President Saddam Husayn of Iraq.

Do not believe that this "government" has anything to do with the Kuwaiti people. Justifying the aggression, Saddam Husayn alleged that he went to the assistance of the "revolutionary government" in order to save it. Then he maintained that a provisional government had been created in Kuwait. A little later he declared that the creation of the "Republic of Kuwait" had been proclaimed. And his latest statement boils down to a claim that Kuwait is part of Iraq. You see the contradictoriness displayed by the president of Iraq over the past few days.

[Belov] What, in your opinion, was the chief reason for the start of Iraqi aggression?

[Al-Du'ayj] To answer briefly, the chief reasons are the following: Kuwait is a small country, while Iraq is relatively big. If you compare the two countries' reserves of natural assets, naturally Iraq has more than we do. But the neighboring regime has not utilized those assets in the most sensible way. Everyone knows about the protracted Iran-Iraq war, which, in the final analysis, had a very negative effect on the country's economy and the people's living standards. All these factors created big problems for the Iraqi leadership. It was in order to "overcome" them and reduce its debts that Iraq decided on aggression against Kuwait, this small but financially prosperous country.

I would also like to point out that during the Iran-Iraq war Kuwait gave Iraq multifaceted free aid worth many billions. But still the war with Iran was a big mistake by Saddam Husayn. The regime in Baghdad has now made a second big mistake by occupying Kuwait. But we are confident that Kuwait will be free again.

[Belov] Tell our readers about the neutral zone that exists on the border between Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

[Al-Du'ayj] That zone is now called a shared territory. More than 10 years ago Saudi Arabia and Kuwait divided those lands in two in a spirit of concord. The flag of Saudi Arabia now flies over the southern part, and the flag of Kuwait over the northern part. All the oil wealth beneath the surface of that territory belongs to the two countries. We have no disagreements with Saudi Arabia over the question of the shared territory. Both countries exported the oil extracted from that zone and used the resulting funds to aid Iraq during the war with Iran.

[Belov] Where are the amir of Kuwait and other members of the ruling family now? It was reported recently that 16 members of the ruling family had arrived in Britain....

[Al-Du'ayj] His Highness the amir of Kuwait is on the territory of his second motherland—Saudi Arabia—along with a majority of the members of the government. In addition, up to 70,000 other Kuwaiti citizens are now in Saudi Arabia. The Saudi brothers are giving my compatriots all the necessary assistance. Other Persian

Gulf countries—the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Bahrain, Oman—also give our compatriots a hospitable welcome. The amir is carrying out all his leadership functions, which are reported on Saudi Arabian television every day.

As regards the reports of the arrival in Britain of an aircraft carrying individual members of the ruling family, they set out for London to fulfill specific assignments. I must point out in this connection that there are more than 2,000 people in the amir's family. Many of its members, like those who flew into the British capital, are now fulfilling responsible tasks in other European countries to assist Kuwaiti citizens who found themselves outside the motherland at the moment of aggression.

[Belov] What would you like to convey to Soviet people through the newspaper TRUD?

[Al-Du'ayy] I would like to address President Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet leadership, and your country's people and express my profound appreciation and gratitude for the support given us and for the stand taken by the Soviet Union with regard to the Iraqi aggression. Your country's peoples themselves lived through a severe war and the Hitlerite occupation and know what it is like. [interview ends]

On the same day TRUD correspondent N. Baratov asked the ambassador of the Republic of Iraq to the USSR to formulate his country's position in the Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict and to express his opinion of possible ways to settle the dangerous situation which has taken shape and which threatens peace in the region and on an international scale.

A refusal to grant an interview followed without delay, in a polite and extremely concise form: One single word was pronounced: "Sorry!"

Comparison of Kuwait Embassy Statement on Gulf

PM0908142390

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 10 August 1990 in its Morning Edition on page 4 carries a TASS report on a Kuwaiti Embassy statement. The IZVESTIYA item, entitled "Embassy Statement," has been compared with the Moscow TASS International English version headlined "'So-Called' Government Condemned" published in the 9 August Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 17, revealing the following variations:

Page 17, column one, second complete paragraph, first sentence in IZVESTIYA begins: [Text] The Kuwaiti Embassy.... (deleting dateline)

Same column, fourth complete paragraph, only sentence in IZVESTIYA reads: ...not recognize this notorious government, since its.... (adding "notorious")

Same column, sixth complete paragraph, only sentence in IZVESTIYA reads: ...cooperation with any side aspiring to have contacts.... (substituting "side aspiring" for "country wishing")

Iraqi, Kuwaiti Students in Moscow Demand Pullout

PM0908204190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Aug 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Indignation Grows"]

[Text] Some 60 students from Iraq and Kuwait studying at Moscow's VUZ's [higher educational establishments] gathered outside the "Progress" Publishing House on Zubovskiy Avenue and unrolled posters bearing the following inscription: "We demand the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait." They then moved onto the Kuwaiti Embassy in Moscow, declaiming slogans in Arabic.

Democratic Party Rallies To Oppose Invasion

LD1008004890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2020 GMT 9 Aug 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] A meeting in support of Kuwait was held today outside the Iraqi Embassy in Moscow. It was organized by the Democratic Party of Russia. Other public organizations also took part, and citizens of Kuwait were also present. The authorized meeting took place in an orderly fashion, under the vigilant supervision of the militia. But some of the speakers, instead of supporting the Kuwaiti people, made accusations against the Soviet Government. [video shows crowd]

[Begin recording] [Unidentified participant] That the Soviet Union has announced a temporary embargo by the Soviet people is (?a fiction)....

[Correspondent] [Name indistinct], these accusations that have been voiced at this meeting against the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government: do you think they will help the struggle of the people of Kuwait to defend their rights?

[Participant] I would say that each speaker expressed his own point of view, and I think there are various opinions. It's in the spirit of democracy that everyone should express his opinion.

[Correspondent] In his interview with our night news program today, the ambassador of the State of Kuwait asked the Soviet Union and the Soviet people for help. How do you assess in this connection the meeting that has been held today? As help?

[Participant] Certainly. It's the expression of.... It's help by solidarity. I think it's help, yes. [end recording]

[Correspondent] After the meeting, those who had taken part in it dispersed in an orderly way, having carefully

cleared up after them—at the request of the militia, of course—the leaflets that they had torn up, bearing portraits of Saddam Husayn.

Phone-In Program Assesses Invasion's Impact

LD0908170790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 9 August carries a 45-minute live phone-in program on the Persian Gulf crisis called "Fire at the Oil Wells" as an installment of the "Repercussions" program.

"Fire at the Oil Wells" is presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov. Other participants are Stanislav Kondrashov, Aleskandr Kislov, Igor Belyayev, and Aleksey Vasilyev. Seyful-Mulyukov sets the scene, describing Iraq's attack on Kuwait and the repercussions. He shows a map of the region, noting in passing that Iraq's forces are equipped with chemical weapons and that U.S. forces are heading for the region. "The Near East once again finds itself on the brink of a precipice," he says. He gives a telephone number for viewers to call up on, with their questions.

Belyayev answers a question about the background of Saddam Husayn. Belyayev describes Saddam Husayn's behavior as unpredictable and illogical. He says the reasons for Husayn's behavior are mostly personal: He claims a dominating role in the Near East. The second reason is that Saddam wants to solve all his economic problems in one go, including the oil price and Iraqi debts to other Arab countries. Belyayev says Saddam wants to revive anti-Americanism in the Near East, and win indisputable authority in the region.

There is a question from Kovalenko in Simferopol about whether economic sanctions can be effective. Kondrashov discusses this question, saying that Iraq depends very much on imports of food and skilled manpower. He says Iraq was a good trading partner for the Soviet Union. We sold it arms and got oil in return, Kondrashov says. The Soviet Union could lose financially because of this situation, he says.

There is a question from Volgograd. Kislov talks about the treaty signed between the Soviet Union and Iraq. He says the treaty was signed in 1972, long before Saddam became the "merciless dictator of Iraq." The treaty has already been violated by the Iraqis. The Soviet Union tried to make the Iraqis see sense, to dissuade it from attacking Kuwait.

There is a question to Vasilyev about the effect of the Gulf crisis on the world economy. Vasilyev reminds listeners about the importance of oil shipments from the Near East. He then fills in background on OPEC and its quota system. Vasilyev explains that the departure of Iraq and Kuwait from the world market will raise the oil price. The oil price has already risen. Oil importers are losing from this situation. Oil producers are gaining. The Soviet Union can gain economically from the oil price

rise, although it stands to lose economically from the loss of Iraq as a trading partner. The rising oil price is a boon to the Soviet Union, he says. "It is a breath of fresh air" for our economy, he adds. Seyful-Mulyukov adds that this is not the breath of fresh air that the Soviet Union really wants. The panel admits that the oil market is not stable. Belyayev answers a question about the reaction of other Arab countries to the crisis, why it has been so "weak." Belyayev says that Saddam is the key figure in this respect. Other Arab leaders have found themselves in a difficult situation. Saudi Arabia has been slow to make a statement on the situation. Only today did it condemn the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. This is surprising considering that Iraqi tanks could be in Saudi Arabia tomorrow. The Syrian attitude has also been equivocal. There is a threat to other Arab states, too. The fact is that the Arab states want to handle the situation themselves, either bilaterally or multilaterally, he concludes.

There is a question on the extent to which the USSR and the United States could cooperate on this problem. Kondrashov says the degree of cooperation between the countries, which until recently were adversaries, has been greater than that of the Arab states, which are directly threatened. The cooperation takes various forms, including support for sanctions. There was the Shevardnadze-Baker meeting at Vnukovo Airport. Objectively, the USSR is giving the United States a certain freedom of action he continues. There is confidential two-way communication between the big powers on ways of safeguarding the two countries' citizens in Kuwait and Iraq. He notes that the forces of the two sides involved in the Gulf are unequal. The Soviet Union has only two warships plus auxiliaries in the Gulf region. The United States has far greater forces there, Kondrashov concludes.

There is a question from Kharkov on the number of tanks involved. Another question asks about the fate of the Kuwaiti royal family. They are in Saudi Arabia at the moment, it is said. Seven members of the family are said to have died during the invasion.

Kislov answers a question about the policy which the Soviet Union should adopt in the situation. The Soviet Union should follow a principled policy, Kislov says. He says it is in fact pursuing such a policy. He says the fate of Soviet citizens in Iraq and Kuwait is vitally important. The Soviet view is that no international dispute should be resolved by force. Peaceful methods must be found, he says. The Soviet Union wants the immediate withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and the restoration of that country's sovereignty.

Vasilyev answers a question on Israel's role in this situation. Israel may rejoice because the Arabs' attention is being turned away from the Israel-Arab conflict. But in the long run it could exacerbate that conflict too. Israel must remember that Iraq has chemical weapons and has used them, both against the Kurds and against Iran, he says. Israel should offer the hand of friendship to the

Arabs. This would benefit everybody. Unfortunately, the current Israeli leadership wants to exploit the conflict, Vasilyev concludes.

Seyful-Mulyakov reads a question in which the panelists are asked to predict how the situation will develop. Belyayev talks about the situation in Iraq and press reports that Foreign Minister Tariq 'Aziz has been removed from his position, and other reports that 200 high-ranking Iraqi Army officers have been executed. This indicates that the internal situation inside Iraq itself is unstable. It is possible that Iraq will launch attacks on other Arab countries, he says. He draws attention to a statement by Perez de Cuellar to the effect that he opposes the involvement of UN forces in the conflict. Belyayev says that an Israeli strike against targets in Iraq cannot be ruled out, especially on chemical warfare facilities. One should remember the Israeli attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor. A settlement seems a long way off, Belyayev says. Iraq has an enormous army, he notes, and another 10 divisions are being formed. This might could be used again.

Seyful-Mulyakov describes Belyayev's prognosis as "quite gloomy." He says that six minutes remain until the end of the program. Vasilyev says it is important that the international community take steps to ensure that the conflict remains within civilized limits. Seyful-Mulyakov regrets that there is still no mechanism for settling regional conflicts, despite the rapprochement between the superpowers. There is another question from a listener in Ufa about ways of defusing the powder keg in the Near East. Kislov says that the conflict could easily spread. There is need for a completely different attitude toward relations in the Near East. He says that Shamir should remember that any attack on Iraq will turn Saddam into a victim in Arab eyes of Israeli aggression rather than the brutal occupier of another Arab country.

Seyful-Mulyakov in conclusion says he hopes that the world community will find ways of putting an end to the conflict and restoring peace to the Near East.

Commentaries Review, Assess Iraqi Invasion

Peace Could Be 'Jeopardized'

*OW1008045890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 8 Aug 90*

[Commentary by V. Lobachenko from the "120 Minutes" program]

[Text] Early this morning in the United States, the implementation of a large-scale operation to deploy airborne troops and combat aircraft to the Persian Gulf region and Saudi Arabia began. In his address to the nation today, President Bush noted the extensive international agreement on the necessity of putting an end to Iraqi aggression. Bush announced that U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf region are pursuing defensive aims, helping Saudi Arabia to defend itself. He noted that Saudi

Arabia previously had made wide use of U.S. weaponry and military advisors, but that the royal government had never before permitted the presence of U.S. military units on its territory. This is a sort of turning point in Riyadh's policy.

This morning in Riyadh another important decision was made. AGENCE FRANCE PRESS reported on the closing of the oil pipeline which goes from Iraq through the territory of Saudi Arabia. Earlier, the Iraqi pipeline going through Turkey had been shut off. Thus, both countries have adhered firmly to the economic embargo against Iraq declared by the UN Security Council. This embargo may turn out to be a more effective weapon for curtailing aggression than all the military power Washington is demonstrating in the Persian Gulf.

It is expected that within a few days the United States will have nearly 200 combat aircraft and several thousand soldiers in the Persian Gulf region. This presence itself is an important restraining factor for Iraq. However, it is hardly likely that in the near future the United States will be able to concentrate sufficient force in the region of conflict to oppose successfully the Iraqi army, which numbers one million men. Moreover, such opposition would entail unforetold consequences. In this regard, a CNN television correspondent notes that the Iraqi army possesses significant supplies of chemical weapons, which it has used more than once in the past. It is also known that in Baghdad and Kuwait there are thousands of people, including children, from the United States and other Western countries. They could find themselves in danger, and become hostages in the case of direct military confrontation between the United States and Iraq. In the case of a large-scale military conflict in the Persian Gulf, they would not be the only hostages: The Middle East peace process and peace throughout the world also would be jeopardized.

Crisis Takes On 'Dangerous Scope'

*LD1008053890 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress
in Arabic 1300 GMT 9 Aug 90*

[Commentary by Nikolay Zimin—read by announcer]

[Text] The military dispute in the Arab Gulf region has taken on a new dangerous scope and dimension. Baghdad announced the annexation of Kuwait to the Iraqi Republic. The Revolution Command Council statement announced the two countries' eternal unity. The statement pointed out that what is involved here is the fact that Iraq has regained its original territories and that Kuwait's annexation to Iraq will not be a precedent in the region; Baghdad has no ambitions on any more territories.

It must be said here that such (?unexpected) news came following Baghdad's assertions that it was going to begin withdrawing its troops from the occupied country. Our radio's commentator Nikolay Zimin points out that world public opinion has felt deceived; it has considered

Iraq's intervention in the neighboring country as a link in the chain of violations against international legitimacy and ethics.

It is difficult to understand President Saddam Husayn's calculations when he took yet again another adventurous step. What are the benefits he is seeking to achieve, given the unanimity of the campaign of denunciations being waged by the international community against such a shameless Iraqi aggression? It is obvious that Iraq is afraid of the comprehensive international sanctions against it. The shut down of the oil pipes, which carry oil through Turkish and Saudi territories, deprives the Iraqi leadership of financial resources. The blockade of ports and railways will, furthermore, leave the country without any commodities; the country cannot rely on smugglers alone! Nikolay Zimin added, furthermore, I think Iraq will have to withdraw its forces from Kuwait sooner or later and will pay a very dear price for it with its reputation and more economic problems. Furthermore, Iraq's military actions harm the reputation of the Arab world as a whole and awaken the old propaganda stories about Arab leaders' irresponsible and unpredictable actions. And the dream about Arab unity is still in the balance. Differences about the Iraqi aggression have emerged among Arabs. Such an aggression has not, however, brought about any benefit to the parties, nor even to the Palestinians who are interested in a just solution to the Middle East. It must be said here that the Iraqi adventure is wholly contradictory to the current world situation. The precedence of the use of force and iron fist is totally against the international community's efforts aimed at bringing to an end the hotbeds of tension on our planet, searching for compromises, and agreeing on the most urgent and important issues of the modern era.

Commentator Nikolay Zimin added: As far as I am concerned, I find Baghdad's aggressive steps bewildering. And one has to feel very hurt, particularly when one knows that most of the weapons used by the Iraqi Army are Soviet made and that our two countries are bound together by a treaty of friendship and cooperation. Of course, finding a solution to the problem and the best means of dealing with it in these circumstances are the concern of the Supreme Soviet and the [Soviet] Government. However, it appears to me that there is a need to reexamine the benefit of keeping such an agreement with a country whose actions for next day cannot even be predicted.

'Act of International Terrorism'

NC1008130990 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Commentary by Viktor Yenkokeyev]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Peace Committee and AAPSO Committee have condemned Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and have called for immediate implementation of the UN Security Council decision calling for the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and for the

establishment of Kuwait's national sovereignty and independence. Our commentator Viktor Yenkokeyev writes:

The vast majority in our country does not agree that Iraq's aggression against its well-disposed neighbor Kuwait was justified, and the statements issued by these social organizations are meaningful. For many years these organizations saw Saddam Husayn as a faithful friend of the Soviet Union, and saw Iraq as the major fortress in the struggle for peace in the Near East. The Soviet (?peace-makers) closed their eyes to the reality that by receiving dollars from Iraq we are nurturing a war monster in this already-explosive area of the world.

The same mistake was committed by our country's official diplomacy which sought unbelievable minor tricks to justify the so-called special relations with Iraq, especially when Baghdad started the war against Iran. At any rate, Iraq was the first non-socialist country with which we signed a friendship and cooperation pact in 1972. At that time the existence of the clause on mutual defense in this pact was described as a special achievement.

Today the Soviet Union's social and state position is one: We condemn the aggression against Kuwait and regard it as an act of international terrorism. Moscow emphatically supported the UN Security Council decision, and halted the delivery of arms to Iraq. Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev sent two special messages to the Iraqi leadership which stated the Kremlin's stand and called on that leadership to come to its senses. But alas! These messages went unanswered. [passage omitted]

The Soviet Union's stand on the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait led to [word indistinct] in the world, and it was not without reason that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker described Moscow's decision as a difficult one. This decision was truly difficult but it was adopted within the context of respect, openness, and correctness—elements that outline the policy of new political thought. This difficult step allows us to look bravely into the eyes of the people and to say that our social and state interests fully conform with the interests of mankind, humanitarianism, and justice. Finally, this step is a manifestation of the decisiveness of the Kremlin's foreign policy and proof that its words and deeds are one and the same, no matter what the price. This is the very stand that is supported by the Soviet nation.

U.S., Soviet Views 'Coincide'

LD0908140990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Interview with diplomatic correspondent Viktor Levin by "Viewpoint" announcer Nikolay Agayants]

[Text] [Agayants] The time has now come, I think, to return to the problem of the meeting at Vnukovo-2

Airport, or, to be more precise, to the reaction of the Soviet Union and the United States of America to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

[Levin] It has already been said that the joint Soviet-U.S. statement, which sharply condemns the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, calls on Iraq to withdraw its troops from Kuwait as soon as possible, unconditionally and unreservedly, and fully to restore the sovereignty of the country is the result of the meeting at Vnukovo-2 Airport. As you know, the Iraqis say they are ready to have the troops withdrawn—they even mentioned a date—but, in practice, they are in no hurry to do this. Naturally, the development of events in the Persian Gulf zone is giving rise to huge concerns. But, since we are talking about Soviet-U.S. relations, I would emphasize that it is the first, I stress, the first time in the whole postwar period that the Soviet Union and the United States of America have produced a joint statement in which their positions completely coincide, a statement pertaining to a most acute issue of a regional conflict breaking out.

[Agayants] Viktor Nikolayevich, what is your view—I recall the recent events in Grenada, the events in Panama, quite fresh in one's memory, when the United States used military force to remove Noriega's government from Panama. OK, so his government was none too popular among the Panamanian population, as witnessed by public opinion polls, but the policy of interference is there for all to see, too, generally speaking? Will the United States continue to conduct itself with as much restraint when the question of the possibility of interfering in other countries' internal affairs arises?

[Levin] Well, it is not a simple question, although I regard it as completely natural. To be honest, I would not vouch for it. On the other hand, it seems to me that the fact that the Soviet Union rules out a possibility of foisting its will on others through military force, even if it is to the good, should, it seems to me, serve as a precedent, and I think that if the U.S. again pauses to ponder a similar problem, it will have to take this factor into consideration, too, without fail.

We make no secret of the fact that Iraq is a friend of ours. But we stress: Iraq is a friend of ours, but the truth is dearer. The truth consists in this—that Iraq has carried out aggression—and we proceed, first and foremost, from moral positions, the positions of the UN Charter, and the United States of America now shares this position. That is why, if you take everything that took place at Vnukovo-2 Airport in its entirety—and I say that it is a milestone in Soviet-U.S. relations—I think that it is possible, looking to the future, to say that it will exert influence both on the international situation as a whole and on the U.S. position in those complex situations which may arise.

[Agayants] Thank you. Here I would like to bid you farewell, esteemed comrade listeners.

'Concern' Over U.S. Buildup

PM0908172590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 10 Aug 90 First Edition p 3

["Military Observer's Viewpoint" by Colonel V. Markushin: "Near East: Tension Mounts"]

[Text] Judging by everything, the sharp deterioration in the military-political situation in the Persian Gulf—which began with Iraq's seizure of the territory of its southern neighbor, and now its annexation—promises to become a major conflict going beyond the framework of the region. Baghdad's ignoring of the world community's demands that Iraqi troops be unconditionally withdrawn from Kuwait is provoking military intervention from other countries. The Saudi Arabian leadership's agreement to the deployment of U.S. troops on that country's territory with a view to defending it from a possible Iraqi attack can be seen as the start of a new stage in the military conflict and of its internationalization.

So far Washington has been talking about the possible use of military force for exclusively defensive purposes. However, in modern operations defensive action can turn into offensive strikes in the twinkling of an eye. That is the pace these days, that is the potential of combat hardware. That is why the incipient concentration of U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf and the arrival there of warships from certain other NATO countries cannot fail to cause concern among people who are closely following the development of events in the region. First and foremost, those who are convinced that under current circumstances peace can still be restored by political methods and economic levers.

What path are the Americans embarking on? We must imagine that it is a question of a naval blockade being prepared, of transport routes for oil and weapons shipments being closed off, and of shows of force being mounted in the shape of intensive Naval and Air Force combat training. To this end the United States is capable within a very short period of assembling a powerful strike force in the Persian Gulf comprising two carrier groups headed by the carriers "Independence" and "Eisenhower," providing them with material and technical support from the Diego Garcia area.

In the future this show of force could turn into a use of force. Combined missile and bombing strikes from the U.S. Navy and Air Force against Iraq's most important military and economic targets can be expected. Carrier-borne aircraft, conventionally armed cruise missiles, B-52 and F-111 strategic bombers, and other hardware could be used together with tactical aviation.

All this, I repeat, is a possible scenario. However, the situation could still be reversed. And Baghdad must take the first steps to that end.

American Goals Questioned*PM0908203090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Aug 90 First Edition p 4*

[Article by V. Linnik: "Near East: Storm Clouds Over the Persian Gulf"]

[Text] New York—The front pages of all American newspapers and the country's television screens have been filled with news about the transfer of airborne assault units, Marines, aircraft carriers, and USAF bombers and fighters to Saudi Arabia and the Red Sea and Persian Gulf around that state. These days television news items have consisted entirely of shots of aircraft landing and ships' holds being laden with military hardware. This the largest deployment of U.S. Armed Forces, 12,000 km from American shores, since the Vietnam war.

It is hard to dispel the feeling that deliberate efforts are being made to give an impression of purposefulness to the White House's large-scale military preparations. U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney does not seem to have obtained the Saudi invitation for the U.S. troops without some effort. However concerned the whole Arab world is at Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the situation today whereby inter-Arab problems will be resolved with the military involvement of another state arouses even greater concern in the region.

President Bush, as his carefully written televised address to the American people showed, realizes the potential dangers of an escalation of the latest Near East conflict. However, I think that verbal warnings to Iraq from the United States and the other great powers would have been sufficient to avert an Iraqi attack on Saudi Arabia and ensure that state's territorial inviolability. Baghdad is perfectly aware that Iraq and the United States are, to put it mildly, in different leagues.

The president's actions enjoy the support of the Congress and the American public as a whole as long as there is no U.S. shooting on the Arabian peninsula and until the first American losses become a reality. The first public opinion polls show that Americans back Bush's intention to prevent an Iraqi invasion of Saudi Arabia. But that is all.

Are there not other more far-reaching aims lurking behind the impressive demonstration of American military might in the Near East? That is a question which many Americans are asking themselves today. A great deal in the future development of events both in the United States and in international policy will depend on the answer to it.

Prospect of Clash Growing*PM0908205590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Aug 90 Second Edition p 4*

[Unattributed report: "USSR Foreign Ministry Statement"]

[Text] The situation in the Persian Gulf area is becoming increasingly dramatic. Following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait 2 August, such serious events as yesterday's declaration of the so-called "merger" of Iraq and Kuwait and the deployment of U.S. naval and air forces in Saudi Arabia, which Washington justifies by the interests of defending that country, have taken place in this region. The tendency for the confrontation to escalate and for passions to be kindled is unfortunately continuing to rapidly gain momentum.

This turn of events provokes alarm and concern in Moscow, since this is all occurring in a region which already has more than enough "explosive material" in the form of chronic conflicts, long-standing grievances, and mutual territorial claims. At the same time the important political and economic interests of a wide range of states, including the Soviet Union, are also closely interwoven here. Hence since the very outset of the crisis in the Gulf area which was brought about by the Iraqi armed invasion of Kuwait we have firmly and clearly advocated extinguishing the blazing conflagration as quickly as possible, restoring the status quo ante 2 August, and bringing the sides to political dialogue with a view to settling contentious issues peacefully.

Apart from efforts within the Security Council, we have had vigorous contacts with the Iraqi leadership, notably via exchanges of messages between the USSR and Iraqi presidents, in order to channel the course of events in precisely this direction. We thought that this exchange of opinions with the Iraqi side had provided hope of things moving toward the fulfillment of UN Security Council Resolution 660, and thus rapidly defusing the crisis.

To our chagrin, we are forced to acknowledge that these hopes have not been justified. Iraq has not only failed to withdraw its troops from Kuwait, but also announced what amounted to the annexation of that country yesterday. It is hard and painful for us to voice this opinion of the recent actions of Iraq—a country with which we are linked by long-standing friendly relations. We would like to preserve this friendship. But we cannot keep silent, much less betray our conscience in this situation. Our approach to this question of principle remains firm—the sovereignty, national independence, and territorial integrity of the State of Kuwait must be fully restored and protected. That is also the demand of the relevant UN Security Council resolutions.

Current events in the Persian Gulf zone demonstrate particularly obviously how important it is to display prudence and circumspection in such circumstances and eschew actions that could add more fuel to the fire. We would once again like to recall that the Soviet Union opposes force and unilateral decisions. The experience of many, many years convincingly proves that the most correct and sensible way of acting in conflict situations is by collective efforts and full use of UN mechanisms.

We are specifically in favor of the Security Council's now tackling this highly acute question on a permanent basis.

We are also prepared for immediate consultations within the Security Council military staff committee, which under the UN Charter can perform very important functions.

We believe that the efforts of the Arab countries themselves could play a particular role in order to prevent the current situation in the Persian Gulf from developing into an even greater military conflict. We have attentively studied reports on the emergency meeting of the heads of the Arab states in Cairo and hope that its results will be an important element in common actions in connection with the situation around Kuwait.

We would once again like to stress that the acuteness and unpredictability of the current situation in the Persian Gulf zone insistently require everyone involved in the dangerous confrontation developing there to show respect for the will of the international community and a sense of supreme responsibility for the fate of peace.

Embargo, Sanctions Hurt Iraq

PM0908180190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Aug 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by correspondent V. Nadein: "Threat of Military Conflagration in the Near East"]

[Text] Washington—After trips to Mongolia, Irkutsk, and then to Moscow—which was not scheduled in advance—U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker arrived in Washington at 0300 hours. He intended to head off for Houston, Texas this Saturday morning to celebrate his mother's 96th birthday there on Monday.

Instead of a family celebration Baker had to set off for Turkey immediately and then on to Brussels. The reason for the celebration's not taking place is obvious—Iraqi intervention in Kuwait and its consequences.

Two Speeches, Two Spurts

Iraqi leader Saddam Husayn and the U.S. president made public statements a few hours apart which should have cleared up a great deal in today's confused situation.

By capturing rich, defenseless Kuwait in 12 hours, Saddam Husayn had an opportunity to create another superpower to dominate not only the Near East. The Iraqi Army is the world's third-largest—after those in the USSR and China. Iraq's oil reserves are now doubling to equal Saudi Arabia's stocks. An outlet onto the Persian Gulf renders the country independent of the pipelines across Turkey, Jordan, and Syria. Kuwait's bank assets solve the problems of Iraq's foreign debt in a flash. Saudi Arabia must henceforth heed Baghdad with trepidation—Baghdad has 18 times more soldiers and ten times more tanks. No one in the Arab world, including highly-populous Egypt, can withstand the pressure from the new aggressive force.

However, it will be hard for Iraq to realize this potential. The UN Security Council's decision puts Saddam Husayn in a position where he may choke on his own wealth. The boycott on Iraqi (and now Kuwaiti) oil has put a stop to the activity of all pipelines. Laden tankers are turning back halfway. Even King Husayn of Jordan, who at first refrained from displaying the slightest unease over Iraq's actions, is joining in the common actions with ill-concealed delight. Turkey has stopped conveying Iraqi oil and Saddam Husayn has had strained relations with Syria for a long time.

Iraq's economy depends exclusively on oil sales. In that country's \$12-billion exports only date sales also merit a mention—something in the order of \$300 million.

However, Iraq imports virtually all the essentials, apart from dates and petroleum products. More precisely, it did. Today its bank assets, like Kuwait's money reserves, have been frozen in foreign banks. The embargo, which all UN members are obliged to observe, covers all goods barring medicines. A famine could begin in the country in a few weeks.

However, this is not lessening the Iraqi leadership's resolve to make full use of the fruits of aggression. Saddam Husayn's latest speech was couched in implacable tones: "We would rather die than be humiliated. We will tear out the eyes of those people who dare to attack an Arab nation."

U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney's hasty trip to Saudi Arabia bore equally rapid fruit. The government of this oil-rich country agreed to U.S. troops' being brought into its territory.

Officially the numerical strength of the U.S. contingent has not been announced, however the mass media have given a precise figure. There is talk of 5,000 servicemen and 140 warplanes.

From the military viewpoint, this detachment is of strictly symbolic significance. However, President Bush in his speech said most resolutely that the United States would not tolerate the presence of Iraqi troops in Kuwait or the puppet regime there. He did not rule out any solutions, including outright combat operations against Iraq on its territory.

The U.S. President's speech was preceded by a storm of diplomatic activity. G. Bush had consultations with the leaders of all the world's leading countries and with the heads of government of all countries in the Near East with the exception of Saddam Husayn himself.

Iraq and Kuwait accounted for 560,000 of the 670,000 tonnes of oil exported daily to the United States, Europe, and Japan. The price of gasoline in the United States has risen by four cents a gallon. One of the country's leading airline companies—American Airlines—has already announced a 10-percent increase in ticket prices.

The U.S. President announced the government's intention to minimize the difficulties for the consumer. Strategic oil reserves in excess of 500 million tonnes will be put on sale. The sending of U.S. troops into Saudi Arabia has halted the fall in share prices on the New York stock exchange. The Congress is no longer geared to sharply cutting back the military complex' appropriations. Observers think that the American economy will succeed in avoiding the impending decline in business activity at the cost of inflation.

Some influential commentators are voicing the opinion that the United States has come up against its most serious crisis since World War II. Other specialists who point to one crucial feature of the current situation take issue with them.

This feature is the end of the "cold war." More specifically, the Soviet stance.

Crucial Test

"By provoking the first serious military conflict in the era following the end of the 'cold war,' he (Iraq's president) has set the most important test of the proposition that the United States and the Soviet Union can work far more successfully together than separately for the good of peace," TIME magazine writes.

The Soviet reaction to recent events has shown how resolutely morality is ousting considerations of transitory pragmatism from the practice of international relations. The USSR has in fact shown willingness to uphold the norms of international law, without dividing aggression into "justified" and "impudent"—depending on the closeness of the ally involved.

I think that observers who conclude that the Soviet political line is based solely on a desire to obtain economic aid from the West are over-simplifying the situation in an inadmissible fashion. I think that dry calculations by accountants would show that the USSR is able to put its budget to rights by means of silence, delays, and half-measures.

Of course, in the long term honesty is not only more pleasant but also more beneficial than playing on other people's difficulties. However, if we return to the complex state of our economy, it is immediate profit that is needed to provide material backing for perestroika. The Soviet Union took the side of the victim of aggression instantly, without hesitation, and this graphically confirmed the irreversibility of the new thinking.

In this respect, the end of the "cold war" has passed the test. Although local commentators point to the Soviet Government's warnings with regard to the likely escalation of combat operations in the Near East, they are by and large giving credit to the fact that, as THE WASHINGTON POST noted, "a less ideologized world is more secure than a world founded on military blocs and a semimilitary economy."

What Next?

Few people doubt that Iraq could not withstand the pressure of a universal embargo. However, mistrust of the Arab countries' ability to independently find a way out of the crisis is widespread in the United States. At the same time sober politicians realize that an exclusively military solution to the problem is beyond the real capabilities of even such powerful structures as NATO combined forces. Although J. Baker's consultations in Brussels, at NATO headquarters, will obviously be devoted to considering precisely these options.

There is a tremendous desire to severely punish Saddam Husayn. His strong-arm attacks, his undivided authoritarian rule and age-old devotion to "blitzkriegs," and his striking ability to quarrel even with those people who previously offered him considerable aid, of course, arouse profound public indignation. Everyone remembers that it was Kuwait and Saudi Arabia which offered Iraq substantial material backing during its eight-year war against Iran.

However, political realities are not always subordinated to noble emotions. Many experts in the current situation see the way out as residing in the fact that those countries that retain some degree of trust in Baghdad have been more active in embarking on the normalization process.

I am above all referring to the Soviet Union and France. These countries were the main suppliers of contemporary arms to Iraq. It is to them, in all probability, that Baghdad will direct its gaze in the difficult days and weeks ahead. A great deal of bloodshed will be prevented if the communications channels are not clogged with blind hatred and implacability.

Iraqi Invasion Assailed

PM1008110790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 10 Aug 90 p 1

[Article by A. Shumilin: "Thief of Baghdad. Iraqi President S. Husayn Announces the Annexation of Kuwait. Mockery of Common Sense? Act of Spitting on World Public Opinion?"]

[Text] So Baghdad has announced the annexation of Kuwait. This means that today the small emirate in the Persian Gulf loses its sovereignty. Let us be logical: If Kuwait is no longer an independent state but a constituent part of Iraq (or the Iraqi empire), then Baghdad no longer needs, as it were, to withdraw the Iraqi troops from that territory! And any attempt to restore the legitimate authority and statehood in Kuwait will henceforth be regarded by S. Husayn as "aggression against Iraq." And in that case the "Baghdad marshal" will certainly refer to international law.

A mockery of common sense? An act of spitting on world public opinion? Undoubtedly so. But it is also a tragedy for an entire people—the Kuwaiti people—and a tragedy for the Persian Gulf region, where, contrary to common sense and the norms of modern civilization, force seems

to have been and to remain the most important argument in "fraternal" disputes. It is also a tragic circumstance that we were the chief creator of the most aggressive force in the region—the Iraqi army. We helped, we helped according to the well-established tradition of "military support for friendly regimes" in the third world, but failed to notice how the Iraqi army headed by the "victorious marshal" S. Husayn had become a monster capable of striking fear not only in its neighbors. According to available data, the Iraqi Armed Forces are larger and better equipped than, for example, the army of any European member country of the NATO bloc. Let us agree: Given such assessments, it is a question not only of a regional threat.

The following data obtained from competent foreign sources are not devoid of interest: The arsenal of the million-strong Iraqi army includes 5,500 tanks, of which 4,100 are Soviet-made; 1,000 infantry fighting vehicles (only Soviet-made); 7,100 armored personnel carriers (only Soviet-made); Luna-M and other tactical missiles (Soviet-made); MI-6, MI-8, and MI-17 transport helicopters; 1,000 air defense guns (only Soviet-made); Tu-22 and Tu-16 aircraft, etc. The share of military supplies to Iraq from France, Italy, and the FRG is incommensurably less.

As has long been the custom, these data could not be obtained from the USSR Ministry of Defense, although they are known to all foreign specialists. And it is not a matter of their being particularly secret, no. It is simply that the very sphere of Soviet weapons deliveries abroad is considered delicate, to put it mildly. This has always been the case. And so it remains today. Let us recall how, during the recent hearings of Defense Minister Yazov and Foreign Economic Relations Minister Katushev in the USSR Supreme Soviet, our legislators just could not get a clear reply to a perfectly specific question: Who directs and controls Soviet weapons exports abroad? Who is responsible for this? And it turns out that no one specific seems to be. No one is specifically responsible for the fact that the kinds of weapons which we supplied to Libya, let us say, during the eighties have come to light in other countries, particularly Iran and Sudan. And the proceeds from such re-exports seem to have gone to Libya, which at the same time refuses to repay to the USSR a sizable part of its debt with regard to the main deliveries. Who will be accountable for the fact that precisely our country was the first to supply to the dangerously explosive Near East region weapons which destabilized the military balance that existed among the warring sides? It is a question, above all, of medium-range bombers of the Tu-22 and Tu-16 type and Soviet ballistic missiles—which every time gave a fresh twist to the arms race spiral in the region.

However, is it worth seeking the guilty parties if our policy in the third world was "my enemy's enemy is my friend" and arms deliveries proved the most reliable means of "strengthening friendly relations"? At the same time the inertia of that policy proved such that few of us evidently asked the question whether "our friend" was

struggling for national liberation or defending with the help of Soviet weapons ambitions which frequently ran counter to the demands of peace and security in a particular region. Would anyone today venture to deny that the true face of S. Husayn—a bloody dictator—was well known to those who adopted the decisions to supply him with Soviet weapons in the seventies and eighties? It seems that morality and ethics did not sit well with our foreign policy. It was considered far more important to simply have "strong friends" with the "revolutionary anti-imperialist phraseology" close to our spirit, while not being concerned about the fact that many of our "reliable clients" there had a reputation in the world (sometimes not without grounds) as countries supporting international terrorism.

Today's events raise a different question for us: Has the Soviet policy of reliance on military cooperation by means of arms deliveries to the third world strengthened our own country's security? Only recently a number of generals would have replied to this in the affirmative. However, I will venture to voice doubts. First, because questions of the use of the Soviet arms supplied were almost always outside the control of our advisers in those countries. And, second, in a region characterized by political instability it is almost impossible to predict in which direction our guns will fire. Today Iraq has occupied Kuwait, firing threats at all who have condemned that insolent aggression. And what will happen in Algeria, let us say, tomorrow, for few people would venture to exclude the probability of Islamic fundamentalists acceding to power there?

I am sure that the escalation of Iraqi aggression and of the conflict caused by it would have been still more rapid and pernicious in terms of its consequences if this had happened some five years ago. "In the times of the 'cold war' these conflicts had a quite specific function," France's *LE MONDE* writes. "By relying on situations which could lead to upheavals in a particular region, the United States and the USSR endeavored to rile [poshchekotat] and crowd each other just a little. The epoch of those proxy wars is over. On the wave of detente in Europe Moscow and Washington are trying, by contrast, to limit and then also settle the regional conflicts inherited from the period of Stalin and Brezhnev."

Indeed, if such a thing had happened some five years ago, the world would have interpreted differently the fact that Kuwait's sovereignty has been trampled by Soviet tank tracks, while the group of Soviet military advisers in Iraq, according to Western sources, is headed by General Makashov, for whom, it turns out, military might and military victories are the sole "guarantee" of a particular state's security. It is a good thing it is not rivalry but cooperation that today determines the actions of the USSR and the United States aimed at extinguishing the dangerous conflict in the Persian Gulf.

Sub-Saharan Africa

RSA Government, ANC Reach 'Historic' Agreement

LD0708092990 Moscow TASS in English 0906 GMT
7 Aug 90

[Text] Harare August 7 TASS—The African National Congress (ANC) and the white minority government of South Africa have reached a historic agreement.

A joint statement, published today after 15 hours of intensive talks in Pretoria, said that in the interests of a political peace settlement and within the framework of the agreement reached, the ANC has announced a cessation of all military activities.

The document emphasised that such a decision come into force immediately.

For its part, the South African Government would consider as a matter of urgency the emergency situation in the Natal Province and the question of abandoning several provisions of the Internal Security Act restricting the opposition.

The delegations, led by ANC Vice-President Nelson Mandela and President Frederik De Klerk of South Africa, also agreed on the phase-by-phase release of political prisoners.

Analysts believe that the nine-item statement may become a prelude to talks that will abolish apartheid in South Africa.

South African Ties Depend on End to Apartheid

LD0908193190 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT
9 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—"The Soviet Union, sharing the attitude of the international community, applies political, economic and cultural sanctions against South Africa," Yuriy Yukalov, head of the Africa directorate of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, told the MOSCOW NEWS WEEKLY.

"But we attentively follow changes in that country and may not allow ourselves to renounce a dialogue with official representatives of South Africa. In particular our contacts with them are now maintained within the framework of the commission for a settlement of the conflict in Angola."

The general director of South Africa's Foreign Ministry, who is at the same time the leader of the South African delegation in the above-mentioned commission, made a stopover in Moscow.

"We availed ourselves of the opportunity to continue discussions," Yukalov said. "That was the first contact in Moscow at such level ever since consular relations were broken off in 1956."

"Diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and South Africa can be established within the next four to five years," Yukalov believes. "The question is at what rate the dismantling of the system of apartheid will proceed. It does not mean that we shall wait until the process is completed. At one with other countries, we adhere to the view that the process should assume 'irreversible' character."

Commenting on press reports about Soviet emigrants in South Africa, Yukalov said that there is no emigration from the Soviet Union to South Africa. But it is not ruled out that Soviet citizens who stay in other countries make applications to this effect through respective embassies, he said.

The African National Congress (ANC), upon having received such data from the press, expresses its indignation in the belief that an influx of brain and qualified labour force contributes to strengthening the South African Government, not the anti-apartheid movement.

In response to a question about Western press reports concerning Moscow circus guest performances in South Africa in December, Yukalov said he does not know so far which group of Soviet performers was meant.

"We may not ban such guest tours but nevertheless we want to caution that such a trip may have most tragic consequences, as was the case once, when English sportsmen visited South Africa and unrest flared up during a match," Yukalov said. "The ANC has already lodged a protest at the announced guest performances and can organise their boycott."

RSA Officials To Help Clean Up Chernobyl

LD0908214990 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT
9 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—A group of South African businessmen specialising in environmental technologies visited the Soviet Union from 2-9 August, according to a press release circulated by the Soviet Ecoprom consortium today.

Ecoprom invited seven South African business representatives after they offered to take part in efforts to clean up after the Chernobyl nuclear disaster, the statement said.

The Soviet consortium decided to cooperate with South African firms due to the extraordinary problems caused by the Chernobyl disaster, it said.

The group, which included South African minister of trade, industry and tourism Kent Durr, visited the Ukrainian capital Kiev, the Chernobyl nuclear power plant and surrounding areas.

The South Africans made several proposals on how to improve the ecological situation in affected areas. They said they will donate diagnostic and treatment equipment to a Kiev clinic treating radiation-related diseases.

Under the tentative agreement between Ecoprom and the visitors, South African firms offered to provide technologies and equipment for emergency measures to clean up after the Chernobyl catastrophe. South African banks will back the program with credit.

Soviet and South African business circles also discussed possible bilateral cooperation after the elimination of apartheid in South Africa.

East Europe

'Rift' Seen Between Polish Party Leaders

PM0808150090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English
No 31, 31 Jul-6 Aug 90 pp 19-21

[Rudolf Borecki dispatch incorporating interviews with Senator and TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC editor Jarosław Kaczynski and International Soros Foundation Polish branch chairman Zbigniew Bujak: "A Strangest War in the World"]

[Excerpts] Warsaw—Local strikes staged by railway workers of the Northern Coast, miners in Southwest Poland, and disgruntled peasants who blocked an international highway did not shake radical reformist innovations but were a signal to the leadership that something was going wrong.

The political earthquake of national significance, however, was a bitter conflict between Solidarity leader Lech Walesa and Premier Mazowiecki. Tygodnik Solidarnosc, the mouthpiece of this trade union movement, thus described the Walesa-Mazowiecki rift: "The strangest war in the world is going on in Poland; a war which is kept secret from the people, an obscure and treacherous war which has slyly replaced the old big war with communism." [passage omitted]

On Saturday, July 7, the opposing parties met at the Warsaw residence of Bishop Dabrowski. The terse communique released after the meeting concealed more than it revealed: "Mr. Mazowiecki and Mr. Walesa have agreed that they shall continue cooperation in the name of the nation's benefit and further democratization." It was not without grounds that Gazeta Wyborcza called the meeting "a mysterious summit."

On the next day, the Solidarity leadership, headed by Walesa, met with MPs of the Civil Parliamentary Club in the formal hall of the Gdansk shipyard formerly named after Lenin. The atmosphere of this outstanding event was adequately conveyed by a Polish TV report. Referring to the Saturday meeting with Mazowiecki, Walesa admitted "The Premier and I agreed that both of us were unprepared for further struggle following the victory over communism." He addressed the MPs saying: "Your electors' opinion, not your personal opinions, is what really counts." And further: "You may work out anything, but a simple sigh from miners and peasants is enough to sweep all your decisions and rules into a waste paper basket."

Judging by the audience's reaction, the opinion of Professor Bronislaw Gieremek, Chairman of the Civil Parliamentary Club, went unheeded. Said Gieremek: "Those who promise to speed up one way to prosperity are engaging in wishful thinking! We are at the very beginning of the road." And he elucidated. "The slogan of unity of the people (the call for unity is the stance of Mazowiecki, Gieremek, Bujak, Michnik and others. - R.B.) is not Bolshevik. (Mazowiecki and his immediate entourage are being increasingly accused of Bolshevik regeneration. - R.B.) Bolshevik is the principle of building up a party at the expense of the people." "That is why," Gieremek said, "the government should be supported, but people must 'watch its hands,' like those of any other government." However, Gieremek's arguments did not impress the audience.

The tense and lengthy meeting filled with accusations and counteraccusations was terminated by Walesa, who after nearly seven hours of debate declared that "he could not stand it any more and was going home."

The situation in the country and the situation in Solidarity, which are closely interconnected, could have been expected. To comment on the on-going split, however, would mean to take the side of one of the conflicting parties. That is why I asked authoritative representatives of both parties to present their own opinions on the current crisis.

The first interlocutor, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, belongs to the actively pro-Walesa Alliance of Centrist Forces. His teacher was the new Marshal of the Polish Senate, Professor Stelmachowski. He himself is a Doctor of Law, was the editor of the underground magazine Glos, became one of Solidarity's leaders in 1987 and took part in the round table negotiations. After Mazowiecki became Prime Minister, Kaczynski replaced him as editor of Tygodnik Solidarnosc. Senator Kaczynski and his brother Lech are close advisors and assistants to Walesa.

The other interlocutor, Zbigniew Bujak, is Solidarity's living legend. Born into a family of Kielce peasants, Bujak started working in industry at the age of 17. He became the leader of independent trade unions at the mammoth tractor-building works of Ursus. In 1980, Bujak, then 26, became the chairman of the Solidarity branch in Mazowsze, the region incorporating Warsaw and other neighbouring provinces. He says his teachers were "the wise and determined Jacek Kuron," "the intelligent prophet Adam Michnik," and others of "the old circle of advisors, naturally including Mazowiecki." Bujak was one of the leaders of the underground Solidarity for four years. After serving one hundred days in prison, he was released and understood that Poland was already different and that "an irreversible process of democratic changes had begun and the regime could not influence developments any more." Today Bujak is the chairman of the Polish branch of the International Soros Foundation.

Naturally, the questions addressed to Kaczynski and Bujak were identical.

[NEW TIMES] What do you think is at the bottom of the current crisis?

[Jaroslaw Kaczynski] The conflict is about the ways to achieve a free market economy and mechanisms of the formation of a new political elite. They (meaning the Mazowiecki entourage: Gieremek, Kuron, Bujak and others called by Adam Michnik "lewica laicka" or the "secular left") believe the way to new society is the implementation of their model.

The ACF believes this way is not realistic; to create artificially a Solidarity-based unity means to deceive people. Political positions must be defined clearly and we must say "No" to advocates or sympathizers of the old regime. People should not have a bitter aftertaste of injustice seeing that they are made to march in one formation with those who had it good under communism and are now back again....

True, we are planning to install Walesa as president of Poland. As far as I know Walesa, he would have preferred informal, non-institutionalized leadership. But in the current situation, he does not have any other choice. His authority can be compared to the authority of the Church alone. He reminds one of a circus rider of two horses who tries to make these horses fall into step with one other. To be the leader of a trade union movement and to support a government whose reforms affect the workers' interests is an unenviable situation.

As president, Walesa could serve as a mediator between the government and the people. Besides, his international authority cannot be ignored. The Czechs and Slovaks exploit the authority of their Vaclav Havel, although his authority is lower than that of Walesa. Last but not least, Walesa is a gifted politician. As a believer, I would say it is God's gift. He has no special education and his tongue may slip sometimes. But God's gift is God's gift!

[Zbigniew Bujak] For me, this conflict is nothing but a clash of personal ambitions. The ACF united a great number of people who have not found their place in the active political life of today. The thing is that Lech Walesa wants to [get to] Belweder (the presidential palace in Warsaw. - R.B.), and Mazowiecki is standing in his way. First, Mazowiecki is a strong rival and Lech Walesa feels it as his own popularity rating is dropping. Second, Mazowiecki is not a man to be ordered about by Walesa and his independence has started to unnerve Walesa. Brothers Lech and Jaroslaw Kaczynski are educated lawyers and clever politicians. They engineered the coalition with former allies of the United Workers' Party: the United Peasants' Party and the Democratic Party. However, Mazowiecki offered them no portfolios in his cabinet. This must be why they became motors of the conflict.

I for one am convinced that in actual fact the Kaczynskis support the Balcerowicz plan. Had they been included in the government, they would have tried to implement this plan most consistently. Now that they are out in the cold, they insist the Balcerowicz plan should be implemented faster, better, etc., doing this for purely propaganda purposes. There are other people too who would like to be at the top. That is why I believe that personal ambitions are at the bottom of the conflict.

No politics is possible without personal ambitions, which I think is perfectly normal. Ambitions, however, must not prevail over dedication to the cause. Some elements of the ACF programme deserve serious attention, but this programme includes speculative slogans too. One such slogan, which smacks of populism, is the one calling for "economic acceleration."

If "economic acceleration" means speedier reforms, the government has a clear-cut programme of reforms which it implements persistently, despite a number of difficulties.

As for the political structure of the state, the ACF shifts the emphasis onto strong presidential power, seeing Walesa as president of Poland. We advocate a parliamentary republic with a bicameral parliament controlling a strong government.

The ACF and we have different attitudes towards the former PUWP [Polish United Workers Party], its nomenclature and property. We want to act legally, within the framework of the law. For example, we oppose the nationalization of party property. We believe that the very principle of nationalization contains elements of coercion and violence. The ACF believes matters of property can be solved by adopting a decree. Very briefly put, their idea is "to rob the robbers." In our view such acts can destabilize the political situation in Poland.

[NEW TIMES] Is it possible to avoid a split in Solidarity, and, if it is, what ways do you see to do it? Can you say you too bear responsibility for a possible split?

[Kaczynski] Mistakes have been made by both parties involved. The Solidarity leadership has long "supported the government blindly." Thus, the government lacked a counterbalance, an opposition, and its contacts with Solidarity weakened. The situation is not hopeless, but today it is more difficult to arrive at an agreement...."

[Bujak] I am convinced that the government-Solidarity confrontation could have been avoided. Today, too, I believe the conflict will be resolved. Despite all our differences, we must stick together until the next elections, assisting the government at this most difficult stage in its transition to a new parliament. Shortly before or immediately after the elections to a truly democratic parliament, it would be logical to form two political parties with original programmes. The split in Solidarity today would be extremely harmful because, I repeat, at the bottom of the current conflict there are personal

ambitions disguised by populist demagoguery. As for our personal guilt... You see, Mazowiecki is a man who can listen but does not want to demonstrate publicly the burden of the responsibility he has assumed. He does not practise broad consultations. As a result, many politically active people do not feel like participants in his politics and start seeking their own ways. Knowing how ambitious Lech Walesa and his entourage are, the premier should have given them a chance to realize themselves in bigtime politics. Mazowiecki's inability to engage in partnership and cooperation makes us partly responsible for the aggravation of the conflict.

[NEW TIMES] What do you forecast for the near future?

[Kaczynski] I don't like to make forecasts. We can only speak of what we wish would happen. Mazowiecki withdraws his claims to the presidency, Walesa does not interfere with the premier's every-day work. Polish society has already made great sacrifices and it will not tolerate an obscure and ambiguous political situation. Agriculture seems to be in for much trouble. This year's harvest promises to be very good, but who will buy it? I am not an expert, but something has to be changed, preserving free market relations, of course. After all, in the West too, governments always rescue farmers who are in trouble....

[Bujak] The best moment to hold elections seems to be the spring of 1991, the 100th anniversary of the May 3rd Constitution. The political rivalry, however, has been aggravated so much, that an earlier election will do the nation good. Perhaps, this election could take place in this coming autumn. Presidential elections are to be held in autumn, too. Hopefully, these will be universal elections. Mazowiecki may run too, I believe. In my view, the office of the president suits Mazowiecki, who is calm and makes well-balanced decisions. A political alternative to the ACF must take shape in the near future too. The fact that the ACF has resolutely distanced itself from extremist nationalist slogans provides prerequisites for cooperation on the basis of shared humanitarian traditions of the old Solidarity.

The model of relations with peasants remains the most complicated one; some 36 per cent of the population are engaged in agriculture now, but five to eight percent would suffice. The leaders of Rural Solidarity refuse to agree that there is no alternative to radical modernization of agriculture and that small unprofitable farms will have to go bankrupt. In this field, the government's social policy must be specially well-considered.

It must be borne in mind that the relations with the working class, especially industrial workers, will not be simple either. The Balcerowicz plan includes stipulations for foreign investments and will provide an opportunity to create new jobs to be filled by workers who had been made redundant after closures of unprofitable enterprises. It seems to me, however, that we are losing the

key to this balanced policy. Most probably, unemployment will be especially severe in large urban agglomerates. The irony of the current situation is that the reforms Solidarity took pains to bring about are meeting a stiff resistance on the part of Solidarity's workers-peasants segment.... [Bujak ends]

This is what the conflict is all about. The familiar division into "the left" and "the right" is out of place here. Both parties are "right" if we consider their attitude towards communism, and both are "left" if we equate communism with totalitarianism. Their differences begin when they start discussing the ways of "postsocialist development," and these differences are quite serious. Suffice it to say that after our talk, about two hundred former supporters of Walesa set up the Civil Movement-Democratic Action as the political counterweight to the ACF. Veteran Solidarity member, Zbigniew Bujak, 35, became one of the leaders of this new group. The movement's slogan is "Forward, without irresponsible action."

In its turn, the ACF has published something like an economic programme. Its authors advocate speedier reforms, higher wages and incomes, lower taxes, credits for peasants and other popular measures. The one thing the programme keeps silent about is where the money will come from.

In my view the root cause of this "strange war" is not personal ambitions. It seems to me that Poland, which demolished the old political regime quickly and painlessly, has entered a new phase of confrontation. People who have lived so many years under socialism fail to accept the rules of the new economic realities based on personal responsibility, risk and entrepreneurship. In other words, people are simply unprepared to become subjects of new economic relations. Sooner or later our country too will have to face a similar conflict.

Poland Proposes Opening Consulate in Riga

LD0908222490 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
1730 GMT 8 Aug 90

[Text] Jerzy Smolinski, the Polish consul general of the Polish Consulate General in Leningrad, is visiting Riga. The consul general had talks with Dainis Ivans, the first deputy chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia, with Chairman of the Council of Ministers Ivars Godmanis, and Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans. In the name of the Polish Government, Jerzy Smolinski proposed opening a Polish Consulate General in Riga. This will evidently be the second after the Swedish Consulate in Riga. Several other questions were also discussed, connected with the expected visit of a Latvian Government delegation to Poland at the end of September this year.

West Europe**Laptev Confers With Nordic Council Chairman***LD0908221290 Moscow TASS in English 2058 GMT
9 Aug 90*

[Text] Moscow August 10 (TASS)—Soviet parliament Council of the Union Chairman Ivan Laptev met and conferred here on Thursday with Nordic Council Chairman Pal Petursson. Both statesmen emphasised the need to develop comprehensive contacts and exchanges between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Nordic Council.

Laptev told Petursson about the parliament's law-making activity, the elaboration of a new union treaty, ways to switch to a market economy and ecological issues. It was stressed that new opportunities for successfully developing bilateral contacts were being opened in present-day conditions.

The sides discussed some aspects of the international situation. They noted the importance of preserving internal stability in the USSR to global security.

Petursson had a talk on the same day at the USSR Council of Ministers' commission on food and purchases. The talk focused on some issues of bilateral cooperation, including on developing links in the processing industry.

Finnish Consul Visits Lithuania 22-24 Jul*90UN2527C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
25 Jul 90 p 2*

[Lithuanian Telegraph Agency report: "Finnish Consul Visit"]

[Text] The Finnish consul to Leningrad, Terkhi Khakala [name as transliterated], was in the republic on a working visit 22-24 July. The purpose of the visit was to become familiar with the economic situation in Lithuania and the consequences of the blockade for the republic's economy.

The Finnish diplomat met with the vice prime minister, Romualdas Ozolas; the general director of the Department of Foreign Economic Ties, Rimantas Purlulis; the deputy minister of foreign affairs, Valdemaras Katkus; and the secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, Yustas Paletskis.

Terkhi Khakala visited the headquarters of "Sajudis" and participated in a meeting with activists of the "Lithuania-Finland" Society.

FRG Interested in Buying GDR MiG's*LD0908205890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 9 Aug 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Soon, a new state will appear on the map of Europe. The change in Europe, and the fate of military equipment, is the theme of the report by Vladimir Kondratyev from Bonn.

[Kondratyev] [video shows a plane in flight and on the ground, as well as a diagram of it; clips from West German TV are also shown, with the voice of a German-speaking announcer heard below that of the Soviet correspondent] Much has already been said and written about that most expensive, most large-scale military project of the FRG. The fighter of the nineties has become the symbol of the meaninglessness of bloc confrontation. What was the fighter planned for? The decision was made before the changes in East Europe—to accompany Tornado bombers and defend them from Soviet MiGs.

In the GDR, the danger that a squadron of modern MiG-29's with German pilots might be adversaries of NATO has now disappeared. Here, West German television reported, citing reliable sources in the GDR Foreign Ministry and the United States, that FRG military circles are elaborating a version of using our MiG's in a pan-German air force. We owe the GDR quite a lot of money through commodity exchange. The acquisition of planes by the united Germany would make it possible to eliminate that disparity.

Great Britain, Israel, South Korea, and the United States have displayed an interest in buying our MiG's.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Decree on State Property Fund Published

LD0908140490 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT
9 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev decree "On the Establishment of the State Property Fund of the USSR" was published here today.

The document notes that the transition to a market economy and the mounting process of transformation of state property into other forms poses the question of state functions in disposing of and managing state property in a new way.

The state, the document says, must create conditions for the rational utilisation and preservation of its property, and find modern forms of utilising it in the economy.

For the swift establishment of state bodies, called upon to speed up the transition to the regulated market economy, the president has decreed that a state property fund should be established. One of the primary goals of the fund is to elaborate and implement the programme of transforming state enterprises into joint-stock societies and enterprises based on other forms of ownership, while simultaneously breaking up monopolies in production.

The president entrusted the fund with protecting property rights and interests of the state, controlling its safety and effective utilisation, conducting the functions of holder of the state share of stock in joint-stock societies, carrying out measures to privatise property, evaluating the cost of state property during its leasing, selling or transforming into other forms of property, and other functions.

If need be, the fund can temporarily delegate rights to manage property, held in nationwide ownership, to other state management bodies, to set up sectoral and territorial property funds on a joint-stock basis. The USSR Council of Ministers was entrusted to draft an ordinance on the state property fund.

Abalkin Views Aims of Decree

LD0908200890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 9 Aug 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today we have asked Leonid Nikolayevich Abalkin to comment on the decree of the USSR president on the formation of the USSR state property fund.

[Begin recording] [Abalkin] The president's decree is a very major step toward refining these procedures and the process of implementing the intended plans. It envisions tackling a whole range of problems. The fund, above all, must elaborate and implement a program for a large-scale denationalization of property; the sale of property

into private or family ownership; the creation of cooperatives; the setting up of joint stock companies; and the creation of enterprises based on leasing before they are sold to their collectives.

What is the purpose of all this? The purpose is to create a real market structure and to create a variety of forms of ownership, without which neither market, nor competitiveness, nor competition can exist, and without which everything will be rigidly regimented. What is also very important is that the process of forming diverse structures of ownership will stimulate the formation of a responsible attitude to property, will wipe out wastefulness, and the sense that this property does not belong to anyone. It will provide real owners of property.

Fundamentally new work incentives will arise. With their aid we hope to defeat negative tendencies in the economy, to ensure that it reaches a high level and that it will come out of the crisis, and to stimulate efficiency and high quality.

Another aspect is very important, and it has been prompted by the experience that we already have through the countries that have taken greater steps toward a market. This is connected with the danger of state property being sold off and squandered for a song. No one knows its objective cost, and there is no one who can assess its cost or define conditions of denationalization, who could protect the interests of the state, and, in the long run, the interests of the people who stand behind state property. One of the most important tasks of the fund will be precisely to assess objectively the cost and conditions of turning it into other forms of relations.

Of course, the practical enforcement of the decree will require great efforts on the part of the government—the executive power. We will have to prepare and present to the president our proposals on the powers of the fund, to work out provisions for it, and above all to strive to make it really work in practice rather than just on paper. But then, that is what executive power must do—it must ensure the firm, consistent, and energetic implementation of the decisions that are being adopted. [end recording]

Petrakov Calls for Legalizing Private Property

LD0908155490 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT
9 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—Presidential aide Nikolay Petrakov has called for the legislation [as received] of private property in the Soviet Union.

Speaking in an interview with the MOSCOW NEWS weekly, Petrakov said a team of experts working on a plan to transform the Soviet Union into a market economy will draft a programme to be used as an economic basis for the new treaty between constituent republics.

The 13-strong team was set up following an agreement between President Mikhail Gorbachev and Russian leader Boris Yeltsin. They will prepare a document that will rely both on Yeltsin's radical reform programme and Soviet Government measures for the transition to a market.

"The programme should be strictly businesslike, without ideological bias, and aim to move to a market with minimal losses," Petrakov said.

"This will by no means be an eclectic programme. The authors are united on most issues and will argue on the sequence of moves and ways to revitalise the finances. There are lots of proposals from Western economists, as well," he said.

The unleashing of free prices when there is no economic competition is absurd. The number one priority is to set the ground for competitiveness, break the state monopoly and launch privatisation, he said.

There is nothing humiliating in Western experts' participation in Soviet reforms, he said.

However, not all Western experts realise the social situation in the Soviet Union. Expert teams must be mixed, he explained.

Yeltsin Meets Working Group on Market Economy

PM0908134690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Aug 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by M. Berger: "Consensus Mechanism Being Elaborated"]

[Text] A meeting was held at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] House of the Soviets 6 August between B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and the working group drawing up the Union program for the transition to a market economy. The meeting discussed the group's working program.

The group was set up on 2 August under an agreement between the USSR president, the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

It is expected that authoritative representatives of all the republics' governments will take part in this work, otherwise the concept as a program for creating an all-Union market runs the risk of being a program on paper only. The creation of the group is seen by many people as a real opportunity to pool the efforts of the republics—many of which have declared their sovereignty and economic independence—and to elaborate a mechanism of coordinated action under the conditions of the transition to the market. This is not an unconditional opportunity, since the elaboration of a general program is being conducted against a very difficult political backdrop. Nonetheless, the experts in the group hope that

realism and good sense will prevail over political ambition and protectionist aspirations and that, despite all the difficulties, it will be possible to reach consensus.

The first official representative, V. Aliaskaitis, expert-observer of the Lithuanian Government, arrived on Monday, 6 August in a small town near Moscow, where the group has embarked on the direct execution of its duties.

V. Aliaskaitis is chief of the economic reform department at the republic's Ministry of Economics. It is typical that Lithuania—the first to declare its independence (although, as is well known, its decision has been suspended for the duration of the talks)—has been the first to send its own representative. This fact attests to the productiveness of direct talks between republics, and to the development of an active dialogue between the RSFSR and the Baltic republics. And there is one other fact which I would particularly like to emphasize in this connection: These events show that the market is the best basis for reaching agreement.

Kirghiz, Uzbek Spokesmen Address Treaty Group

PM0908132290 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 8 Aug 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Consultations in the Chamber of Facets"]

[Text] "Roundtable" meetings are continuing in the Grand Kremlin Palace's Chamber of Facets between working groups from the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Council of Ministers, and plenipotentiary representatives from the Union republic Supreme Soviets. Kirghiz and Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] plenipotentiary representatives set out their proposals on the question of the concept of the new Union treaty 7 August.

S.B. Begaliyev, leader of the Kirghiz SSR working group, deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's Gosplan [State Planning Commission], pointed out that a renewed Union is necessary for both political and economic considerations. The Kirghiz SSR advocates the retention of the USSR, the continuity of the 1922 Treaty on the Formation of the USSR, and the transformation of alliance relations on democratic principles in order to guarantee the sovereignty and equality of all republics. Concrete proposals have been submitted to the republic's representatives on how to reflect in the Union treaty such ideas as a definition of the status of an autonomous formation, the list of powers that should be delegated to the center, and the establishment of the principle of unification [printsip obyedineniya].

B.S. Khamidov, Uzbek SSR representative, deputy chairman of the Uzbek Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's Gosplan [State Planning Commission], set out his proposals. In particular, he

described the republic's concrete approaches and positions on the conclusion of a new Union treaty.

Both working groups unequivocally advocated the creation of a union of sovereign states. It was agreed that work on the draft of the new Union treaty would continue in the republics.

The USSR Supreme Soviet and USSR Council of Ministers working group included the following: G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations; N.N. Gritsenko, V.G. Kucherenko, and Yu.K. Sharipov, chairmen of USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities commissions; and V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The consultations in Moscow with representatives of the republics' Supreme Soviets will continue.

Hijacking Attempt Thwarted in Orel 9 Aug

LD1008103790 Moscow TASS in English 1024 GMT
10 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 10 TASS—Yet another attempt to hijack a Soviet civil airliner with passengers on board was thwarted in the Soviet Union.

At 0930, Moscow time, on Thursday, a single-engined AN-2 biplane was landing in the town of Livny, Orel region, in central Russia. A passenger entered the cockpit and hit one pilot on the head with a heavy object in an attempt to hijack the plane, a USSR Interior Ministry spokesman told TASS today.

The criminal was apprehended by the second pilot. According to preliminary data, the criminal's last name is Chernyavskiy. The resident of Tula region was born in 1947 and has a criminal record. He recently worked as a watchman in a kindergarten.

The injured pilot received medical aid. An investigation is under way.

Gorbachev Sends Greeting to Young Pioneers

LD0908220390 Moscow TASS in English 2118 GMT
9 Aug 90

[Text] Moscow August 10 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev today sent a letter to an all-union rally of senior-form pupils that is taking place in the Young Pioneer Camp Orlyonok in the Crimea.

He thanked them for the invitation but declined in view of the "existing circumstances."

In the letter Gorbachev referred to Soviet schoolchildren as a generation "who will, probably, be the first to get rid of fettered mentality that has become almost ingrained in the genotype, of the psychology of non-freedom and of a distorted view of universal human values."

"The country is on the threshold of profound transformations in both the economy, state forms of our multi-ethnic community and in the sphere of further democratisation of our entire society," Gorbachev pointed out.

"Yes, we are living through a crisis but this is not a catastrophe but it is a difficult divide on the way to renewal and rejuvenation of the country," the president wrote.

He described it as the meaning of perestroika "within the framework of the socialist choice to carry out revolutionary changes along the road of asserting freedom, democracy, openness and humanisation of all relations between people in our society, to return to the beginnings of the socialist ideal and to overcome, at last, the alienation of person from the means of production, from power and culture. Herein is the essence of the concept of perestroika."

Gorbachev called on schoolchildren "to work out their own view of things amid the abundance and diversity of food for the mind and to amass their own, personal treasure-house of culture."

He expressed conviction that "youth organisations and among them, I am sure, such a political organisation as Komsomol (Young Communist League), can and will play an immense role in shaping these qualities of the personality and citizen."

MVD's Bakatin Discusses Crime Statistics

PM1008092390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 Aug 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with V. Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, by IZVESTIYA observer Yu. Feofanov; place and date of interview not given: "What the Militia Can and Cannot Do"]

[Text] [Feofanov] You must know your enemy in order to combat him. This would seem to be an elementary condition of success. Do we know the enemy, Vadim Viktorovich? The statistics are frightening, of course. A few days ago our newspaper published the latest tables received from your ministry. A reservation was made: "The figures, naturally, do not fully reflect..." But what is the purpose of these figures if they do not reflect? To frighten people? To get hold of resources, funds, and manpower? To mobilize people? Especially since there is mention of "a huge mountain of unrecorded crime." But if it is unrecorded, we could assume one of two alternatives: Either the "mountain" is much greater, or everything is considerably exaggerated. Many legal scientists believe that criminality is much more stable and has not really snowballed to register a 50- or 100-percent growth. It is said that criminality in 1984 was as high as in 1989.

[Bakatin] Statistics are well and truly unreliable. Do crimes still go unrecorded? I think they do, but not as much as before. Is it especially frightening? Journalists get frightened, but not the militia. We need a true

picture. But the recording system suffers from numerous shortcomings: There is little it can offer the professionals. What we need are not bare figures but figures which give an indication of the forms, methods, and categories of offenses. Roughly speaking, not simply the number of thefts but the way they were committed; through a fanlight, through a door. Now we are in the process of revising the entire statistical system to make it give us a complete picture of events and persons. At present, 40 percent of the statistics are simply not needed by anyone.

Now about the growth and peaks of criminality. Facts are facts. This, if you like, is inevitable. Society is on the move, the economy is falling apart. Some laws are no longer in force, the ones that have been adopted are at times ineffective. We are unable to cope with democracy. I do not wish to say that perestroika is to blame. But you must agree: The transition from one state of society to another cannot be ideally balanced, there are anomalies. It is not a question of simple disruption in our country, it is a matter of chaos. This, as you will appreciate, promotes the growth of offenses. Furthermore, some 800,000 persons have been released from the camps—what are they up to? Have they all restructured themselves overnight? Hardly. The legislative base remains as it was, the law enforcement system has been departmentally fragmented. To put it briefly, a no-win situation. And criminality is turning this to its advantage—it has become more sophisticated and technically better equipped.

[Feofanov] As well as better organized?

[Bakatin] Of course. There was much that we were not prepared for; we found ourselves paralyzed. Take rallies for example. It was terrible to start with, nothing like it had happened before. Or strikes. And what about inter-ethnic conflicts? Being the minister, what do I have on my plate now? Georgia, the railroad saga. The crossings have not been captured by ordinary bandits. Everything has proved to be much more complex—things like that used to be simply unimaginable.

[Feofanov] People are amazed: Why have measures not been taken against the captors? After all, capturing a railroad station is nothing but gangsterism. Someone telephoned me: Why don't they drop paratroops there? Why not, indeed? A rally raising sundry slogans is one thing, but to paralyze railroad traffic is something quite different.

[Bakatin] The Ministry of Railways Collegium and Comrade Konarev requested me to do exactly that. But what could I do? Bring in the Internal Troops, that's all. But in order to bring in the troops you need to proclaim a state of emergency, you need a government decision. And something else: Can you imagine the consequences? We are not talking about some plotter, about some gang that has blockaded the track. This is a mass political movement. And there you are, talking about an airborne

landing. Those informals were backed by tens of thousands of people; the railroad workers themselves refused to move the trains. To bring in the troops would have meant risking bloodshed. We did not take this path. And correctly so. Nonetheless, the Georgian leadership did manage to resolve the conflict by political methods. Politics is finding it only too painful to become part of our new democratic way of life. And this is happening, I repeat, against the background of market chaos, interethnic disorder, complexities caused by republics proclaiming their sovereignty. Outbursts of offenses are unavoidable in such circumstances.

[Feofanov] But if their dynamics were to be traced over a longer period...

[Bakatin] The picture would of course be more or less smooth; I'm not talking about numbers, which are high, but about shifts. The highest level of crimes over the 10-year period was recorded in 1985—just over 2 million. There was a sharp decline in 1986-1987. This is attributed to the anti-alcohol campaign.

[Feofanov] I am not all that sure of this campaign's usefulness. Even though it did, of course, bring crime down initially. But what is the overall result? A man was recently killed at one of Moscow's suburban stations for the sake of two bottles of vodka. It appears that previously people got drunk and then killed, now they kill in order to get drunk and then go out on the rampage again. Legal scientists say that, even so, criminality is more or less stable.

[Bakatin] The scientists are right. Criminality is a social phenomenon, society does not develop by leaps and bounds. With the exception of individual stages, like the one we are living through now. Consequently, criminality is governed by its own laws. Take homicide statistics over the 10-year period. The number of homicides reached 20,000 in 1980, and remained at that level throughout the subsequent period. It reached 20,500 in 1989. In other words, the chart shows a straight line with the exception of 1986-1987, when it dipped downwards. Absolute figures may vary, but the trend remains. Previously, people used to grab whatever figures they fancied in order to improve indicators. Do you know what makes me feel happy about being the minister? I managed to declassify statistics. The only secret figures are the number of detainees and of death penalties. I would reveal them to glasnost as well.

[Feofanov] Even though the level of criminality may be stable, it is still alarming. And here is the main point that worries people: It seems to them that no measures are being taken. Whenever a classical hooligan, thief, or violent person starts a fight, breaks in an apartment, or attacks people, everything is clear-cut—there is no contradiction at all between law, morals, and politics. But when you come to acts like these—criminal in essence

but actually politicized—does the state, and consequently your own ministry, have any sort of legal concept? It is, after all, impossible to give in to extremists simply because they make political demands.

[Bakatin] From the viewpoint of the law currently in force, the actual seizure of the station is a purely criminal offense. But when the law was being adopted, nobody could even imagine that criminal actions could be so closely associated with politics. This is what makes things complicated. After all, under the law events at the railroad could be classed as an act of terrorism, as gangsterism, with punishment going as far as the execution squad. But when the masses get out, when the railroad workers themselves refuse to move the trains, the thing to do is not to look for the appropriate article of the Criminal Code but to embark on talks. There is no concept at all for the present; the sole concept is to avoid violent actions. I have had no real opportunities to apply the law and yet avoid casualties. Let me deviate slightly from the topic. Full power is being shifted to the republics. What are their mutual relations with the center? This is not yet clear. Estonia's minister of internal affairs and I just signed a treaty. Their MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] is now just a republic rather than a Union-republic ministry. How should the center operate there? I am no longer in a position to issue orders to the republic minister like before. But seriously speaking, this is a constitutional crisis. We have to maneuver, if you like, since we are still living in a single state, but it is no longer what it was yesterday.

[Feofanov] All well and good—crisis, treaty. But here I am, an ordinary person being terrorized by criminals. What do I care if they are classical hooligans or a politicized mob, a thief under the law or a fighter for democracy. I appeal to the militia: Protect me. What will the militiaman tell me: Let's figure out who actually committed offenses against you, was it a criminal or a supporter of the latest political stream?

[Bakatin] Of course the militia is duty-bound to protect you, and this is what it does. Whether it does so badly or well is a different matter. Nonetheless, as I already indicated in the case of the railroad, it cannot do everything....

[Feofanov] Looking around the streets of Moscow you would see plenty of militiamen, but they are nowhere to be seen in a small town.... But people are certainly not protected against criminals, be it in the capital or in the provinces. Your staffers and journalists alike write: There's a shortage of cadres, there's a shortage of vehicles, there's no equipment. How much is actually needed? Do you have any scientifically substantiated estimates? Let us turn back to the IZVESTIYA item. It drew what seemed to be a substantiated conclusion: The growth of crime cannot be attributed only to shortcomings in the militia's work, but "internal affairs organs are fully to blame for unsolved crimes." This seems right. But in order to solve a given "mountain of crimes," they have to be "processed" by the existing manpower. Let us

say that the solution of 1,000 crimes requires 100 detectives and the "processing" of their material needs 10 investigators. A pipe will not carry 200 cubic meters of water if it has been designed to carry only 100. You could promulgate resolutions and decrees by the thousand, you could sack old ministers and appoint new ones, but the number of unsolved crimes will keep on rising unless the "pipe's" carrying capacity is boosted. Is there any scientific estimate of the correlation between criminality and the requisite quantity of available manpower and equipment needed for the solution of crimes? You are an engineer, Vadim Viktorovich, and have probably not forgotten the strength of materials theory....

[Bakatin] There is nothing! Despite the fact that we have all sorts of academies—we even have a management academy—there are no elaborations at all. We have no idea of the proper workload per investigator or detective; whether it should comprise 20 or 80 cases. What should the militia density be? How should it be measured? Who knows. Per capita? Per square kilometer? Yakutia's open spaces are one thing; Uzbekistan's neighborhoods are something completely different; the Vyatka countryside's customs are unlike Georgian customs. This also has an effect on law and order. You picked an apt simile when you mentioned pipes. When I arrived at the MVD, I took a look through an engineer's eyes. No normatives—a desert. Targets have been set now; the work gets done. But only yesterday I was given an order to sign: The workload per investigator, it said, should be 21 cases. I asked: Why 21? No answer. Proceeding from practical experience, I would say this: Our "pipe" is overflowing; we are pumping away under pressure. I told you that the level and dynamism of criminality are stabilizing. But the crime solution indicator is worrying: The growth of unsolved crimes has doubled compared with the growth of actual crimes. Accusing the militia of malfunctioning—you are working only half as well, people say—is just for public consumption. The pipe cannot carry any more. Generally speaking, the equipping of the militia is something else that is not done according to scientific normatives; we are given whatever is available.

[Feofanov] New categories of crime have emerged now. Look at racketeering. But neutralizing a gang of racketeers is something more complex than investigating a drunken brawl. You say that this is another sphere without scientific normatives. But what are your academies doing?

[Bakatin] They are also restructuring themselves. Take the problem of tracking down criminals. We still lack much of what is being used in the West. Nor is it just a matter of equipment. For example, both we and they make use of informers. Very well, let's not call them informers so as not to embarrass the people: operations-investigations activity. A requisite element in the work of any police or militia force. Another area without any concepts, methodology, or laws. Everything over there is openly legislated, even though the work itself is an internal police matter. We also should have an open law

on informers, or rather on operations-investigations activity. Why be embarrassed about it? Society must know about this.

[Feofanov] Some time ago, when new work methods were being introduced in the MVD, old-timer detectives told me about precinct officers; the former precinct officers. Every settlement, every district—or microrayon, in current parlance—had its own Uncle Vasya or Prokhor Ivanovich. Not very literate—parochial church school, four grades, just about able to read and write, and that was all. But they knew their beats like the back of their hands. Someone broke into an apartment, started a brawl, or attacked someone else—these Uncle Vasys needed no computers to work out who was the culprit: That job was done by Kolya the Lip or Zhora the Sailor. And everyone knew them and went to them. Later on, I was told, officers with academic badges appeared on the scene: They knew everything, but would not tackle a drunkard; someone got into an apartment—they would call out the criminal investigations squad. I have no wish to idealize Uncle Vasya. Nonetheless, Vadim Viktorovich, do you not think that the precinct officer is a key figure in the maintenance of public order?

[Bakatin] He is the equivalent of a minister at his level. Such people are extremely necessary, plus a pair of assistants for each one of them. Once again, we need scientific normatives. The present proportion is 4,000-4,500 residents per precinct officer. But 4,000 per officer in Yakutia—what does this mean? By the time he gets to the scene of an incident, people will have aged or remarried. The precinct officer is the key figure who has to perform all of the MVD's diverse functions. Diversity of functions—we have 33 main administrations. The precinct officer represents all the main administrations, he carries the entire burden. I am telling you, he is like a minister. All the main administrations converge upwards toward me and downwards toward him. He must be a prestigious and respected figure. My predecessor Vlasov raised salaries to 300 rubles; tax-free pay, free telephones, some of the apartment problems were solved. Once again, everything depends on local soviets. But another process also got under way: Officers from criminal investigation and other services ran off to become precinct officers. The MVD now has a total of 60,000 vacancies.

[Feofanov] Is this figure—60,000—large or small?

[Bakatin] Not very large, about five percent. But the misfortune is that vacancies are on the increase. There were only 30,000 recently.

[Feofanov] I already said this: Moscow can hardly have any vacancies, there are plenty of militiamen in the streets.

[Bakatin] Moscow is no indicator. We have a militia density of 17-18 per 10,000 residents, or per 50,000 in

Moscow. Generally speaking, this density is in line with world standards—it is approximately the same in other countries.

[Feofanov] And how about professional standards? I have written a lot about the militia in the past. All the official reports and everything we wrote always pushed the idea of relying on the population, on the working masses. Apparently our militia would have been lost without them. I would not make so bold as to appraise the people's companies, they probably did help impose order in the streets. There was a time when people's companies reached their peak: Guys used to march wearing red armbands, and afterwards young girls were running away from hooligans. Forgive me, but I have little faith in the public's strength in the struggle against crime, especially against organized professional crime. "Workers' detachments" have now been set up, they are on the point of being armed. To what effect? Isn't the creation of these companies and detachments some sort of lightning conductor leading away from the militia: Let the population take care of its own safety. And the authorities have a good cover: Look, we set up the detachments, the companies.

[Bakatin] The workers' detachments are made up of the same members of the old companies, and nobody has been arming them. They were set up so that people could get paid for patrolling the streets. Actually, they never took over from the militia. I believe that the militia's professionalization includes the ability to rely on the public. Not to show off but to do the job. Whenever necessary, a professional will involve the church, religious communities, women's councils, and so on. There was a lot of formalism in the companies' movement: They were headed either by ispolkom [soviet executive committee] deputy chairmen or by raykom [rayon party committee] second secretaries; set quotas had to be met, and so on. All these companies breathed their last, they simply disappeared. By way of reviving the companies, it was decided to fire enthusiasm by means of money: The workers' detachments were set up.

[Feofanov] Do you not find this a distortion of the idea of volunteering?

[Bakatin] As an idea—yes, but I find this step justified from the viewpoint of current tasks, as a temporary measure to back up each militiaman with another two guys. But let me repeat this: Nobody has set any professional tasks to workers' detachments, nobody has been arming them with pistols and sticks.

[Feofanov] But people suddenly started saying that they were something akin to pogromists, members of the Black Hundreds—just to break up rallies.

[Bakatin] There was talk about it. But this is not true. If something like that had happened somewhere... But I do not know anything of the sort, believe me. No, no, there was no idea at all of using workers' detachments against demonstrations. Even though, I repeat, there was some talk to that effect. But people talk about all sort of things

nowadays.... Alas, everything in our country is done by spurts; and the workers' detachments are agonizing.

[Feofanov] This probably depends on the state of society. Before the war we used to have workers team volunteers and Society for Assistance to the Defense of the USSR volunteers—pure enthusiasts. The first members of the people's companies worked not for money but for the sake of doing the job. And they helped impose order.

[Bakatin] Yes, if only we had them today—those enthusiasts, those Don Quixote's—I would jump at them, rather than using money as bait. Here is an interesting point, worthy of social psychologists' attention. It seems that society has been emancipated and power has been democratized. Elections, debates, everything is allowed. And social apathy against this background. I recall what happened in Novokuznetsk: An informal movement for ecology came into being. The gorkom [city party committee] then came out with an initiative: Let's have an environmental protection rally, and afterwards take up the shovels and plant a garden. People came to the rally, but after the rally... all the shovels remained where they were. It is the same with public order. For as long as all the steam is used to blow whistles, we are hardly likely to get anything done.

[Feofanov] But do you not think that the flaw of the old and the new system alike lies in the fact that we pin too many hopes on resolutions. How many resolutions there were "On Enhancing the Struggle," and we were so often disappointed that we have ceased to have faith in anything at all. Temporary committees to combat crime were created only recently. And the result? There was talk of separating the pursuit of criminals from the investigation of crimes, there was an experiment with creating autonomous investigation organs. It seems that you terminated it on becoming minister. I have heard it said that you terminated it in vain, but this is not the point. I have a more general question. Don't all these processes of organization and reorganization divert attention from the professionalization of the struggle against crime? What do all these resolutions produce, apart from the fact that the number of vehicles is growing....

[Bakatin] Oh yes, this is the most important point—all about vehicles. No, but seriously... Criminality is a most complex social phenomenon. There are some comrades who want to slam their fist on the table and solve the problem. Yet another resolution—yet another illusion. This applies to reorganizations and to laws alike. Look at what is being done about speculation. Resolutions were adopted—to step up, to terminate. And what has happened? Growing speculation. I am against resolutions for public consumption. What do we hear at the congress, at Supreme Soviet sessions? Impose order! Put an end! Adopt resolute measures! And now the investigative committee. Fine, we will set it up. Do you think that a lot will change, seeing that the entire criminal justice system is inefficient? I perceive the flaw of the law enforcement

system in the multiplicity of departments, the fragmentation. There we are, about to create yet another department—investigative. I can anticipate your objections: Procedural norms, guaranteed rights, and so on. All this must be regulated. I have no legal education and am prepared to accept the procedural specialists' opinion. But will the creation of the investigative committee produce any effect now? I do not think so.

[Feofanov] But, Vadim Viktorovich, it is necessary to guarantee the procedural independence of investigative work. Are we likely to achieve this without organizational measures?

[Bakatin] Let me repeat: I am in favor of civilized justice. But the legislator must solve all this comprehensively, not in bits and pieces as it is happening now. After all, now we are in a state of total confusion. The Prosecutor's Office has been tasked with coordinating the work of law enforcement organs. Why the Prosecutor's Office? Is this the purpose of its activity? A conference once a year—and that's the total extent of coordination. And the entire burden of the struggle is borne by the MVD. How can we disperse everything? Create yet another department? Fine, we will get everything done at the top: We will allocate a building, provide a garage, there will be an office. But what happens at rayon level, where you have three investigators? What sort of department will that be? I visited one rayon: A kid investigator and two pregnant women. This must also be considered before the committee is set up.

[Feofanov] Let's not argue. You have expressed your view—and that is the main point. You touched upon the question of the Supreme Soviet's legislative activity. The extent to which laws adopted by the Union's parliament assist the struggle against crime. And state acts in general. Don't you think that unrealistic tasks and demands that cannot be met only go to harm the cause? For example, one of the CPSU Programs set the task of totally eradicating crime. You must agree that this is not fully realizable in any society. Or let us get closer to reality: The struggle against speculation, of which we have already spoken. The procedural law was simplified. I am convinced, however, that the only result was to "sweep in" only casual persons with hardly any effect on speculation, no matter how hard the struggle against it is waged, it is only growing.

[Bakatin] I have already spoken about this. Of course, criminality will exist for as long as man with his passions exists. The main point is not the type of programs and laws to be adopted, it is the way they are implemented. In my view, the Supreme Soviet is working in spurts—first one law, then another. And yet there must be a comprehensive package of laws governing criminal justice. Look what happened with defense attorneys. A law was adopted: Give defense attorneys access to the preliminary investigation. But where is the defense attorney? He is not to be found, and the investigation is dragging on. I am in favor of defense attorneys, in favor of the right to defense. But an extract of the text was

picked up and released for public consumption. And the result—no benefit to the cause, no right to defense.

[Feofanov] You are against departmental fragmentation. But demands are made of the KGB to actively join the struggle against purely criminal offenses. It has always done this—look at the cotton affairs, for example. But this is a completely different department. Strictly speaking, the committee is being forced to do someone else's job. It has educated and skilled cadres, equipment, experience. It would be more logical to hand over to you part of its manpower, equipment, and personnel. So that everything comes under one roof.

[Bakatin] Let's try and reason again. Principles are one thing, the harsh reality of the day is something else. No system can remain static. From the viewpoint of the optimum model, I am in favor of the KGB dealing only with its own affairs: intelligence and counterintelligence. Everything that happened before—dissidents and suchlike—that's gone. Internal crime—racketeering, bribery, terrorism—ought to be under the MVD. Everything external under the KGB, everything domestic under us.

But let me repeat that this is the principle, a model, the ideal as it were. To embark on such a reorganization now would mean inflicting harm on the cause. We must stabilize the situation with the available manpower. In the economy, and in everything that is covered by the words "law and order." Only then we should move forward.

Case Against KGB's Kalugin Reported

PM0908103090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 31, 12-19 Aug 90 p 5

[Article by Natalya Gevorkyan: "A 'Case' Which Is None of Our Business. Oleg Kalugin: 'I Still Keep State Secrets to Myself'"]

[Text] On July 17 Aleksey Vasilyev, acting General Procurator of the USSR, instituted criminal proceedings against Oleg Kalugin on the basis of materials from the USSR State Security Committee (KGB). As announced by the USSR Procurator's Office, the mass media in the USSR and abroad—with reference to former Major-General of the USSR KGB O. Kalugin and on his behalf—revealed state secrets (Article 75, Criminal Code of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]).

"I didn't think they would go to such a length," Oleg Kalugin commented. And he left for Krasnodar where, on August 19, he will possibly be elected a USSR people's deputy. It will be recalled that he is running for the seat vacated by Ivan Polozkov.

The investigation is being handled by the Main Military Procurator's Office (MMPO). On July 25, MMPO chief Aleksandr Kautsev told an IZVESTIYA correspondent that he had no documents at his disposal except the ruling signed by Vasilyev. On July 26, however, he

refused to give any information to an MN correspondent, merely stating that "the case is being handled by the MMPO." It is not clear how it could happen that the agency handling the preliminary investigation received the materials two days after this was made public in the press and nine days after proceedings were begun. A promising beginning.

To understand how the situation would develop according to the law, we consulted Aleksandr Larin, LLD.

"It is interesting that the date of the ruling on instituting criminal proceedings given in the press coincides with the date of Kaulgin's resignation as a candidate for deputy—July 17. A strange coincidence. Why do I pay attention to this date? If Kalugin is put on trial, then according to the Law on the Election of People's Deputies, his trial can proceed only with the consent of the electoral commission or the country's Supreme Soviet in the event of his winning the election. As the matter stands, this permission is not required. As far as suing Kalugin is concerned, we can speak about this only after answers have been given to these two main questions: did the information in the mass media really amount to a state secret at the moment of its circulation, and who is responsible for its circulation (Kalugin or journalists)? If the case reaches the court, is an in-camera trial possible? I see no reason why such a case should be tried at a closed sitting of the court—whatever has been published in the press is no longer a secret even if it once used to be a secret. And the last thing: Article 75 of the Russian Federation's Criminal Code calls for two to eight years' imprisonment.

The most mysterious aspect of Kalugin's case is the very notion of "state secret." No one, even the spokesman for the Main Administration for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press, could give an explicit answer to my question about what this means (there is no law on state secrets). Incidentally, if the Procurator's Office decides that secrets were divulged, the responsibility logically rests with Glavlit (censorship) which was still responsible in June-July. At any rate, in those cases when materials were still censored (as, for example, in MN). Kalugin's statements do not fall under any of the guidelines about information prohibited for publication in 1990, which governed Glavlit's activities. Any information on the KGB's activities must be published with permission from this committee. We do not know whether or not Glavlit requested such permission.

At the KGB it was explained that there are regulations of the Council of Ministers on state secrets—a statutory act, naturally secret. In the commentaries to the Criminal Code edited by Professor Mikhail Karpushin of the KGB Higher School, the following explanation is given: "divulging a state secret must be understood as making public information amounting to a state secret..." An exhaustive explanation. In reply to a direct question to Aleksandr Karbainov, chief of the KGB public relations centre, as to whether he could cite an example of

Kalugin's encroaching on state secrets, he said: "As I see it, from the legal point of view such an example can be found in his statement on whether or not we have sources in the CIA." This example further compounds the situation—Kalugin declared that we had none but only in reply to a KGB statement which said that a valuable source in the CIA had been lost owing to Kalugin's unprofessional actions.

Aleksandr Karbainov told the MN correspondent that the USSR State Security Committee had not requested the USSR Procurator's Office to institute proceedings against Kalugin. He said that in keeping with the law, publications in the mass media might become an occasion for instituting criminal proceedings. The phrase "on the basis of KGB materials" in the statement means that the Procurator's Office could address the committee with a request for additional materials. So we have the following picture: the vigilant Union Procurator's Office closely followed all of Kalugin's statements and brought a case against him on divulging state secrets on its own initiative. But the KGB had nothing to do with it. Believe it or not.

Thus, we have been unable to get a clear answer as to which of Kalugin's statements harmed the state, and in which mass media. Furthermore, by what criteria are these statements to be assessed, and who are the experts (Glaslit, the KGB?) that will give the verdict? We don't know whether the information already divulged continues being considered a state secret. Is it the information disclosed abroad by former KGB officials, or information which was public knowledge long before Kalugin spoke out, like the bugging of telephones.

A question to Kalugin: "Maybe you know what a state secret is? Did you or did you not divulge one?" His reply was laconic: "I still keep state secrets to myself."

Oleg Kalugin considers his having been stripped of military rank, orders and medals, as well as pension, to be unlawful. With reference to the pertinent articles of the USSR Constitution and the Russian Federation's Criminal Code, he sent a letter to the Moscow City Court requesting that action be brought against President Mikhail Gorbachev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov and Chairman of the KGB Vladimir Kryuchkov. This happened on July 30. On July 31 the letter was not yet received at the dispatch office of the Moscow City Court. A similar document has been forwarded to the Constitutional Supervision Committee.

In the meantime the election campaign in Krasnodar is in full swing. For all its peculiarity, Kalugin's situation is strikingly familiar: if at the top they say he is bad, at the bottom people see him as good. Events develop according to the laws of physics—to every action there must be an equal and opposite reaction. And those who are creating yet another martyr do not realize it. It is pointless to rip the medals from a general and even savage him at the hands of the Procurator's Office. He is not the cause but the effect of changing public awareness.

Society has already posed its questions and there is no escaping them no matter what turn the ex-general's fate may take. Slogans like "Down with the KGB" are unfurled at rallies right in front of Lubyanka. They are not just a bad dream, but a hard fact of life. The numerous statements in the press about the need to reconsider the existing state security system are also a fact. It's a fact that in the mentality of many people the KGB is associated with whatever is hateful. Broad support for Kalugin's statements and his nomination as a candidate for deputy are facts. All these facts are real components of public opinion—it exists and does not forgive the slights which are inflicted on it.

There are many things to do. There is a crying need for experts, and not just to find out whether or not Kalugin divulged state secrets, but in order to decide how we should live in the future, so that this very state should not totally crumble together with all its secrets.

CPSU Deputies Criticized for Careerism

PM0808185590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 28 Jul 90 First Edition p 1

[Article by Vyacheslav Lukashevich under the "Seven Days" rubric: "They Came From the People, They Have Gone From the Party. What Now?"]

[Text] I make a proviso right away: The time frame of our discussion topic is going to be considerably broader than the traditional seven days. Indeed, any problem we may look at today—political, economic, demographic—has its roots in the remote or the more recent past....

Once, back in the preperestroika days, the editorial office sent me on an assignment to meet with one of the elders of Belorussian literature, Academician I. Shamyakin. At Ivan Petrovich's home on Janka Kupala street in Minsk we talked about our native Belorussian land, not yet "dusted" by the ash from Chernobyl, and its industrious and talented people. The writer's daughter, who had served us tea with thyme, had the radio on at half-volume in an adjoining room. As if in the distance, as if back in those far-off years of revolution, we heard a marching song: "We all came from the people, we're children of the workers' family...." Ivan Petrovich listened for a while, screwed up his eyes in an artful expression, and said: "Some of them around here 'came from the people.' And no way do they want to go back to the people, you understand." He tossed out this remark quietly, aiming it not at the song but, so I thought, at some specific individuals, most probably some high-handed top leaders....

I called to mind this, of itself, insignificant play on words by my countryman and then asked myself: Isn't something of the same kind happening to others, to our present-day people's elect? It turns out to be so, comrades. Look, judge for yourselves. All the deputies I know, no matter which I choose, have acquired weighty portfolios in the year and a half since they were elected. One has become mayor of a big city; another is mayor of

an even bigger city, a capital; a third is a deputy mayor, a fourth—a Russian minister.... Others have not disdained humbler positions at the kray and oblast level. And the surprising thing is that even a few months ago some of them were vowing and swearing to their voters that they didn't need any jobs, that the people's confidence was for them both the highest payment and a full-time job. Certainly readers, Leningraders in particular, are bound to recall such assurances being given, for example, by A. Sobchak to television viewers in the early spring. These vows melted away, alas, with the thawing snow.

My opponents will object that this was precisely the reason why the elections were fought with such passion, so that people's deputies could take the helm of power. I agree. I would even add that I pin great hopes on the work of the new soviets set up by the democratic route because at the 28th party congress an effective division of power occurred, between state power and party power. Wasn't this the reality for which many people's deputies were striving?

But is it possible to trace here also a different, already familiar situation: Before, we "elected" deputies according to their portfolios, whereas now the same portfolios have passed into the hands of elected representatives, with the result that everything has turned "full circle." Some have forgotten their pre-election platforms, programs, and assurances while the voters find themselves playing the part of hapless parents abandoned by "prodigal" sons. I don't know about you, but as a voter I personally feel as though I've been fixed, even deceived in some respects, since my deputy is no longer striving for my interests because he has acquired interests of a different order. In the end it's even possible to dismiss personal egoism. It's possible to accept, too, that the new chairman of Moscow City Soviet is in no position to force back smokers right away to their legitimate places of work from those absolutely unparalleled tobacco store lines; any more than another chairman—the chairman of Leningrad City Soviet—is responsible for the destruction of smoked sausage by the tonne in "partisan" districts. But then Sasha Bogdanov, who lives on Leningrad's Vasilyevskiy Island, can scribble in his amateur little rag ANTISOVETSKAYA PRAVDA that "the deputies have gotten a thing or two out of perestroyka: apartments, cars, dachas, special distribution centers, and political capital. The conservatives have gone off into oblast combined enterprises, and the liberals have taken over Leningrad and Moscow Soviets, making official trips abroad and picking up per diem, travel, representation, and other allowances." Of course, I beg readers' pardon for this quotation, but after all, Sasha Bogdanov's little rag, until the Law on the Press comes into force, is read by the masses. So this enchanting lady on the Moscow suburban electric train palms a rag off on me at its fixed price—a hefty half-ruble.

It seems to me that all this applies not only to "certain civilians," but also to certain—I again use that once-active word—deputies from the Army. And privileges like a residence permit for the capital and raven-colored cars, from behind whose windshields the voter acquires rather a dim outline, have a magical effect on those elected in remote provinces. And remember how only quite recently those who ran for election outside their place of residence were stigmatized in our parliament's halls!

However, there is another side to this coin: political popularity. To stay on the tip of the people's tongue—what lengths will be gone to for the sake of that! For the sake of that—popularity—even some deputy dressed in an "ill-cut" uniform will criticize the Army that raised and nurtured him, while a Communist deputy—and there is quite a considerable number of such instances—will jettison his party membership like the used stage of a booster rocket. It being of no further use, since the party has already carried him into a high orbit.

As I see it, this is being done for various political reasons. Some people have become scared of taking responsibility for the crisis situation in society—from which, incidentally, the Communist Party does not shrink. Others have realized that boosting the CPSU's authority and prestige is no easy matter today, that it is easier to dissociate oneself from it and withdraw to the sidelines. And it is not surprising that anxiety is growing in many of our readers because of this. For example, this is what I. Shatskaya from Minsk writes: "My husband joined the party at Stalingrad at the beginning of 1943, and 50 years later here, in the Belorussian parliament, People's Front Chairman Z. Poznyak can state in a speech that all Communists must be eliminated. My husband wanted to take him to court, but the procurator would not accept the writ..."

Yes, today it is easier to leave the party for some reason or other than to come to its defense. However, the party is quite capable of standing up for itself. The 28th CPSU Congress is eloquent testimony to this. The very fact that they did not succeed in splitting the party at the congress is prompting others to "slam the door behind them." What's more, in an institution where it is possible to stop applauding. How this resembles, it seems to me, those times when certain sons and daughters abandoned their own fathers, who had fallen by denunciation into the category of "enemies of the people!"

We are not talking about such things as integrity and honor. Just as certain elected representatives of the people do not ponder the fact that the voters gave them their votes, possibly, just because they ran as Communists, and that if one of these "deserters" were to run again now, nobody knows whether he would win a deputy's seat. Although in this instance I take the side of Kharkov reader Major V. Kliychuk: "Those who are leaving the CPSU were never real Communists. Let them leave: The atmosphere in the party will only become healthier..."

I would like these lines from Major V. Kliychuk to be read by Lieutenant Colonel S. Yushenkov, RSFSR people's deputy and lecturer at the V.I. Lenin Military Political Academy, one of 54 Russian deputies who signed a statement published in ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. "The party that has led the country into the toughest economic, social, and political crisis is preserving its command structures in state organs....," they write. "On moral and political grounds we consider it impossible to remain members of such a party any longer."

The statement of the 54 Russian deputies calls for a democratic congress to be held as soon as this fall to create a wide political coalition. True, the authors do not reveal the aims of this association. But I would still like to know.

I do not think that all the electors of Moscow's Kiyevskiy Territorial Okrug, having entrusted S. Yushenkov with a deputy's seat, agree with such a statement. And isn't this the "going away" from the people that we have already spoken about?

Yes, to come from the people and to leave the party is now becoming fashionable. But will it help us get out of the crisis that has arisen in the country, the blame for which is being laid only at the Communist Party's door? The party, which as the sole real political force in the country is proposing specific measures to overcome the difficulties that have arisen, and which makes pan-human values its precise aim? At any rate it is as clear as can be that it is easier to deliver the country from the deadlock by sticking together rather than by breaking up into pygmy groups, factions, parties, or alliances. Will we grasp this?

Delays at Border Checkpoint Engender 'Tension'

LD0908210190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] Uneasy tension is mounting hourly at the Brest checkpoint. After obtaining passports with a special insert, thousands of our citizens who are in a hurry to exercise their right to go abroad are continuing to arrive here. People's anxiety is heightened by the fact that as the government of the country has announced, from 10 to 11 August admission through the western border will be restricted primarily to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Despite the fact that frontier guards have gone over to working round-the-clock, lines at the checkpoint are not getting smaller. A line of cars is stretched for a few kilometers from the bridge across the Zapadnyy Bug River to the center of the town at the Brest frontier crossing. Nevertheless, the frontier guards and customs officials believe that they will be able to ensure a normal frontier crossing to all those who arrive before 10 August. Then the government's decision restricting simplified exit will come into force.

Economic

Implementation of Small Business Law Discussed

LD0908212790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] A press conference devoted to the decision adopted by the USSR Council of Ministers on measures to develop small enterprises took place in Moscow today. Here is our correspondent, Tatyana Filippova:

[Filippova] The decision which has been adopted is another step, and a very important one, in the implementation of the program for the transition of our country's economy to the market, to freedom for enterprise. Stanislav Vasilyevich Assekritov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers' Commission for Economic Reform, stressed this in his statement:

[Begin Assekritov recording] Today, having recognized small business and placing our hopes on it, we are thus giving each citizen the opportunity in essence to realize his constitutional right to work not only in a state enterprise or the legalized cooperative sector but in this form of activity as well. A small enterprise can be set up in any sphere of the national economy and each citizen, each family, and each labor collective has the opportunity to organize its own business, a business which is to its liking and brings it the maximum benefit.

The next step must be the adoption of the law on freedom of entrepreneurial activity. Such a law is also being worked on: It is virtually ready now, and we shall also submit it for examination by the Supreme Soviet. You know that the whole world has today set off on the path of developing and providing state assistance for small and medium-sized businesses. We are proceeding along the same path and we are counting on being able to now create, within the framework of all the restructuring that is going on, very powerful small enterprises from the viewpoint of technology which are able to adapt quickly to changes in market demand and to restructure their technology quickly.

The main thing is that we also want to create new jobs in the process. You all know that unemployment is possible. This is, as it were, a precautionary measure. Small enterprises provide the opportunity to create new jobs, so the state will stimulate the creation of these small enterprises in every way possible. We must do this in the countryside too where, as you know, there is seasonal production, where it is possible to create small enterprises which can operate in the period between seasons. [end recording]

[Filippova] The creation of small enterprises promises to become something advantageous. The state envisages significant benefits, including benefits in taxation. Now for a few words on what a small enterprise is. It is an enterprise with up to 200 employees in industry and construction, up to 100 in science, up to 50 in other sectors of production, up to 25 outside the productive

sphere, and up to 15 in trade. A small enterprise is completely independent in its economic activity, choice of its form, and the amount of payment for its employees' labor. That is very important. A small enterprise acquires the right of a legal person and all the rights which have been spoken about from the day of its registration at the executive committee of the local soviet.

The decision points out that small enterprises can be established on the basis of any form of ownership. A question which I believe is very important for their activity was asked at the press conference: Does this mean the recognition of private ownership of the means of production? Here is how Academician Nikolay Pavlovich Laverov, a deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, answered that question:

[Begin Laverov recording] This question has been discussed very seriously for we are dealing with a situation where those citizens and family members who organize such small enterprises are going to be hiring on a contractual basis those who work there—concluding contracts and defining relationships in those contracts. In essence, I believe that private ownership is perfectly possible. There is no lack of clarity here; it is all definite. [end recording]

New Resolution on Monetary Exchange Discussed

LD0908205290 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS world service analyst Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—An important step towards the convertibility of the ruble and the establishment of a market infrastructure has been taken in the Soviet Union. In accordance with the government resolution adopted recently, permanently functioning monetary exchanges will be established in the country from next year.

They are called upon to become "centers for making deals involving foreign currency on Soviet territory and concluded at market rates," the document says.

In addition, all enterprises that have the status of a legal entity in the USSR will be granted the right from January 1 to sell and buy foreign currency for Soviet rubles, not at the official rate but at market rates.

A number of Soviet financiers believe that this measure by the government is a step towards renouncing the rather abstract exchange rate of the ruble against foreign currencies that existed for years and which is increasingly turning into a curb on the country's foreign economic relations.

The Soviet Government resolution breaks the established practice according to which Soviet enterprises in all operations were guided by the official exchange rate.

Only two or three times a year did they manage to address their currency problems at auctions—which had many restrictions.

According to information from government circles, before the end of the current year cooperatives and most importantly joint ventures registered in the USSR and involving foreign capital will be gradually allowed to buy and sell foreign currency.

If so, the Soviet Government's decision will open the door for repatriating the ruble proportion of profits gained by foreign participants in joint ventures and will thereby remove one of the main obstacles to attracting foreign investments to the USSR.

It seems that the government is serious about vesting the State Bank of the USSR (Gosbank) with new functions: Gosbank will increasingly play the role of a central bank under the conditions of a market economy open to international cooperation.

Similar to its counterparts around the world, Gosbank will be able to take measures to maintain the exchange rate of the Soviet ruble, resorting for example to the release of additional foreign exchange resources—both its own and drawn ones, including from foreign partners.

Of course, specific forms of Gosbank operations will be decided in the future. But these new forms of operation can become a reality only if the country manages to keep a single financial and banking system.

The aim of the recent decree issued by President Mikhail Gorbachev is precisely to maintain such unity.

Decision makers in the USSR increasingly draw in their work on the experience of those East European countries which, when faced with similar economic difficulties, resorted to economic experimentation. This applies first of all to Poland and Yugoslavia which, in quest of the convertibility of their national monetary units, firmly abandoned individual enterprises' special currency accounts in banks in favor of free currency operations and monetary exchanges.

Leasehold Coal Mine Faces Pioneering Problems

PM0908123190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 6 Aug 90

[Report by V. Voronov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Many of us link a successful transition to the market with the development of leasing relations. However, the introduction of leasing does not automatically improve an enterprise's indicators. Here is a report from the Kuzbas from the leasehold Chernigovskiy open-cut mine.

[Voronov] To begin, let me juxtapose two facts. Last year, eager to become a leasehold enterprise and seeking fair starting conditions from the Ministry of the Coal Industry, the miners were unanimous even when there

was talk of a strike. Now, having obtained their leaseholding rights and taken over the management of the mine, many of them disagreed with the decision of the Leaseholders' Council to remove a number of team leaders from their posts. There were good grounds for this decision. The team leaders paid little attention to discipline, they were not exacting enough, and they tolerated violations. Yet indifference spells death for leaseholding.

In six months of work under the leaseholding system, the miners obtained 1.5 million rubles of above-plan profit, and it could have been even more. What was the problem?

Labor productivity at the coal face decreased, equipment idle time increased, and as a result coal extraction and the volume of overburden stripping work diminished.

But unfortunately the leaseholders' prosperity does not depend on the results of their work alone. The laws on leaseholding and the enterprise are still not functioning because a mechanism for their application is lacking. As a result the economy is literally tottering under the impact of constantly changing prices and normatives. And no matter how strange this may seem at first glance, it is not advantageous for a collectives to tap its reserves.

[V.G. Zabolotnov, chairman of the Leaseholders' Council, Chernigovskiy open-cut mine] When many if not all the enterprises around us go over to leaseholding, then we will have a market, we will have market relations, and only then will there be—how should I put it—free competition and free enterprise, and only then will we finally grasp that genuine private ownership is necessary instead of the attitude which prevails now. Only then will true proprietors [khozyayeva] emerge.

City-Country Relations Improving in Belgorod

PM0908131490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 6 Aug 90

[Report by Ye. Novikov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Of late there has been much talk in various quarters, in the press, and on television about the cities' debt to the countryside. One of the main tasks today is to repay this debt. Unfortunately, this is not happening everywhere. But wherever people have passed on from words to deeds you can see relations developing between industrial and agricultural collectives, and you realize that it need not take years to repay this debt.

Take a look at the relations between the city and the countryside which have taken shape in Belgorod Oblast.

[Novikov] People in the villages of Grafovka and Bezlyudovka could not have dreamt that a time would come when living here would be a joy, when even people from the cities would want to come to live here. There is a choice of jobs which are not confined to fields and livestock units. They have their own plants here or are in the process of building them, including a mixed feed

plant, a dairy, and a sausage factory. These villages have been brought back to life by the Belgorod Energomash Association. It repaid the millions of rubles which the kolkhoz [collective farm] owed the state and invested its forces and resources into the enterprise which was now its own. And the returns amount to an annual increase in meat production of 50 kg per every member of staff of the Energomash Association.

[V.V. Bulygin, chairman of the Belgorod Agro-Industrial Complex] Another form of cooperation is investment of capital by the industrial enterprise in agricultural production on a contractual basis. We are expanding and deepening this type of cooperation. Industrial enterprises are eager to participate. They are building hay and root vegetable storage facilities, sociocultural amenities, and housing. And at the end of the year output is divided up in proportion with the invested capital.

Here is another example, another form of relations. This is the Severnoye plant. It was built by industrial enterprises. It processes 10,000 tonnes of feed. What kind of feed? Low quality grass which was wasted before. Now we obtain valuable vitamin-enriched feed from it. A total of 250 million rubles have been invested by industrial enterprises over the past four years to assist the countryside.

[Novikov] The relations between city and countryside in Belgorod Oblast are quite varied. Their common denominator is economic interest. Workers' collectives benefit directly from their assistance to the countryside which is expressed not just in the greater availability of food products in city stores.

Agricultural

Commentator Analyzes Government Harvest Figures

PM0908164190 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 10 Aug 90 p 1

["Commentary on USSR Goskomstat Report" by Nikolay Osychkin: "August Is Pressing"]

[Text] August has arrived, the decisive month in harvesting and procuring grain and other crops. The USSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] reports that, as of 6 August, grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) had been threshed on 28.1 million hectares in the country. This represents 27 percent of the sown area and is 16.5 million hectares less than at the same time last year. In many areas work has been held up for a long time by the rainy weather. And it is only recently, when fine weather has set in, that farms have started using combines in the Central Chernozem Region, the Volga region, and the Volga-Vyatka and Western Siberia economic regions. Steps are being taken in Belorussia to increase the pace of harvesting to 100,000-140,000 hectares a day. Reaping is nearing completion on farms in the Ukraine, Moldova, and the Central Asian republics.

Grain yields per hectare are in excess of 32 quintals which far exceeds the level of preceding years. All this is the result not only of the clement weather but above all of the growth in crop farming standards, the introduction of intensive technologies and the most productive grain crop varieties, and competent work by crop farmers in the fields. Yields per hectare are 32.8 quintals in the RSFSR, 37.5 quintals in the Ukraine, and 13.9 [as published] quintals in Kazakhstan.

In all, more than 90 million tonnes of grain have been threshed, including 16.3 million tonnes in the past week. However, only 28.3 million tonnes have arrived at grain reception centers as yet. In all, 6 million tonnes have been purchased over the past week—less than in the preceding seven-day period. Kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] in the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], Stavropol Kray, Rostov and Donetsk Oblasts, and the Kalmyk ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] have coped with state orders.

At the same time, around 60 million tonnes of grain have built up on farms' threshing floors which, given the changeable weather and approaching fall, cannot fail to prompt alarm for its safekeeping. Yet farms in the SSR of Moldova have only fulfilled their state order by 34 percent, selling 12 percent of their yield. The corresponding figures for the Tajik SSR are 25 and 11 percent. Few high-grade grain-crop seeds have flowed into state resources—just 13 percent of the planned level.

Harvesting of winter rape is over. According to operational figures, yields were 15.3 quintals per hectare, and 146,000 tonnes of rape oilseed have been purchased. Mustard threshing is nearly over. In Volgograd Oblast this crop has been harvested on 123,000 hectares, and 120,000 tonnes have been threshed of which more than 50,000 have been sold to the state.

Along with the inclement weather conditions, the pace of harvesting work is being held up by the considerable lag in the targets for shipments to agriculture of fuel, lubricants, harvesting equipment, motor transport, and spares. The situation over the supply of batteries to kolkhozes and sovkhozes is not being rectified. There has been a delivery shortfall of 110,000 of them. The situation with regard to motor vehicle tires has deteriorated. There is a shortage of 5,000 tires for "KAZ" trucks alone.

The winter sowing period is upon us. Winter sowing has been carried out on 123,000 hectares in the RSFSR. The conditions for immediate work are favorable. The moisture content of the soil is good almost everywhere. However, the soil is being prepared slowly in a number of areas owing to harvesting delays. A difficult situation is emerging over the supply of rye seeds on a number of farms of the central Chernozem area and the Middle Volga Region where seed-breeding plots of this crop have not yet been threshed. Cognizant of their full responsibility for the fate of the future harvest, agronomists and all crop farmers are called upon to accelerate

preparations for the winter sowing period and to carry it out successfully. This is required by the interests of solving the food problem.

Details Given of New Purchase Prices for Produce

PM1008082990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Aug 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR Council of Ministers. New Purchase Prices for Field and Livestock Unit Produce"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution 9 August on the introduction of new state purchase prices for agricultural produce as of 1 January 1991. These have been ratified at Union level under a restricted list of products for the period of the transition to market relations.

The government has set purchase prices for sunflowers, sugar beet, cotton, flax products, tobacco, high-grade tea leaves, basic kinds of livestock and poultry, and milk and cream. On average, prices will rise by 32 percent. As is well known, new prices for grain crops were introduced in May.

The procedure for establishing the level of purchase prices for all other kinds of agricultural output and raw materials will henceforth be set by Union republic governments. A mechanism is envisaged for annually amending these prices in order to maintain the necessary equivalence in exchanges between agriculture and other sectors.

The state purchase prices ratified by the USSR Council of Ministers are bound up with the new wholesale prices and tariffs for industrial output and services as well as the change in taxation, insurance, and other relations between agricultural enterprises and budgets which creates better conditions for work on the principles of economic autonomy.

States of Emergency Declared in Many Regions

Kuybyshev Oblast

LD1008085190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0800 GMT 10 Aug 90

[Text] A state of emergency has been declared in harvesting in Kuybyshev Oblast. Using all its power, the presidium of the oblast soviet of people's deputies had to adopt such a decision because the harvesting situation had begun to deteriorate. Despite a major yield, what has been mowed and threshed to date amounts to as little as a fourth of the wheat harvested during the same period last year.

The oblast's towns have not yet fulfilled their obligations to send mechanics to the field. Over 1,000 more are required. Because of this, combine harvesters are standing idle on some farms. The greatest problem is that the growing flow of wheat is having difficulties in

reaching the granaries. There is a catastrophic shortage of transport. Vehicles which are so needed for harvesting are thus spending days at the gates waiting to be unloaded.

Grain deliveries via rail are proceeding poorly. The state of emergency gives the town and rayon executive committees the right to demand that enterprise managers, regardless of their departmental subordination, should comply with the decision on assisting the countryside. Those managers who fail to dispatch people to the countryside will be severely punished, including dismissal.

Certain people in the oblast have described the decision on emergency measures as a return to the command and administration system. Perhaps there is some truth in this. But in the current situation, when a bumper harvest of wheat and vegetables is perishing, there is perhaps no other option. Everyone will have to work strenuously up to 30 September, the day the emergency situation expires.

Smolensk Oblast

LD0908153290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1200 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] The subject of gathering in the harvest, of storing the harvest of grain and other crops, is essentially at the center of attention of the entire country one could say. Our correspondent in Smolensk reports today that the oblast soviet of people's deputies was forced to declare emergency measures. A record harvest has been grown for this Non-Chernozem Zone region. Experts estimate that in Smolensk Oblast 1.1 million tonnes of grain can be gathered. The difficult situation is due primarily to the shortage of working hands in the countryside.

The soviet of people's deputies has therefore called on blue and white collar workers and on engineers and technicians from enterprises, organizations, and institutions to be sent to gather the harvest regardless of what department they belong to. Students of colleges and vocational-technical schools will start their studies late. It has been decided to call up for the harvest some of the reserve servicemen, too.

Cooperation Plan Helps Solve Farm Labor Problem

PM0908122390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 6 Aug 90

[Report by V. Chistyakov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The alarming situation which has taken shape on the country's fields demonstrates once again that the countryside cannot cope with feed procurement, the harvest, and other agricultural work without outside help. So far the city dwellers' response to appeals for help has not been enthusiastic although the shortage of food products is likely to affect them above all. In some oblasts a state of emergency has had to be introduced in order to save the harvest. I believe that

help from the cities and introduction of the state of emergency are merely short-term emergency measures. What is needed is a new system of relations between cities and the countryside which would be based above all on economic interest. The first examples of such cooperation between cities and the countryside already exist. Here is a reportage from Kostroma.

[Reporter] This land belongs to the Trudovik kolkhoz [collective farm] in Sudislavskiy Rayon. The Kostroma No. 2 Passenger Road Transport Enterprise [PATP] has built a livestock unit for 150 head of cattle in the run-down village of Desnevo. Last year it bought pedigree livestock. The feed comes from the kolkhoz. The animals are tended by workers from the enterprise who live nearby in a new, well-appointed block. The entire output is divided into two in proportion with the contribution made by each of the sides. One part goes to the kolkhoz, the other to the road transport enterprise.

[I.F. Khristov, director of the No. 2 PATP] This year we will have 20 kg of meat for every worker and somewhere in the region of 100 liters of milk. Next year we will produce 40 kg of meat and 200 liters of milk for every worker.

[Reporter] The kolkhoz members only ask as many people as they need to help them. It would be to their disadvantage to ask any more. They all have to be paid. And with the switch to economic independence no one has any spare money. It is no longer the practice to send people who are of little use at the enterprise to help at the kolkhoz. During the sowing season, feed procurement, or the harvest, workers readily come to the assistance of the kolkhoz. They do not regard their work in the countryside as an additional vacation as was frequently the case in the past.

Vladimir Dimitrovich, how does the kolkhoz benefit from this kind of cooperation?

[V.D. Chichagov, chairman of the Trudovik kolkhoz] For one thing, they are helping us to revive the village which had been written off before. They are building housing there. They also help us with manpower on the basis of long-term relations. Right now they are already helping us to fulfill the state order for milk, and we hope that in the longer term they will help us also with meat.

Price System Hinders Leaseholding in Kazakhstan

PM1008090390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 7 Aug 90

[Report by V. Glukhovtsev and V. Lazarevskiy from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Our next report from Kazakhstan is also devoted to new work methods in agriculture—leaseholding. Please note that as soon as the conversation turns to the restructuring of business relations the need for a revision of prices immediately comes up. This indicates that the market is taking shape.

[Reporter] Land improvement workers have brought down water from the mountains, installed Dnepr sprinklers, and the water operating under its own pressure is irrigating these feed crop fields. There is no need for electric motors or diesel engines and pumps, and this keeps running costs down. And even more important, the water is used in a 100-percent practical manner. The result is good grass growth and high-grade hay.

The kolkhoz [collective farm] has leased all this land to its best feed procurement workers and is now receiving three times as much alfalfa hay.

Cameramen Lazarevskiy and I took these frames of team leader Faramus Bakirov and link leader Vladimir Syrovatskiy. That this is a good crop can be seen at first glance. The alfalfa is standing up like a wall and it is being cut at the best possible time, before it started properly flowering. This is a guarantee of its high nutritive value and protein content.

What yield are you achieving? Is there any difference under the leasehold system?

[F.O. Bakirov, team leader] There is a tangible difference. Now that we have gone over to leasing, people feel that they are in charge of the land. This year we have had two mowings of alfalfa. Each mowing produced approximately 80-90 quintals of green bulk per hectare. This is the third mowing. It is producing 70-80 quintals of green bulk per hectare.

Machinery, anything you touch at the moment is very expensive, you understand? Meanwhile our produce, which is so badly needed both in the cities and in the countryside, is priced very low. Having to buy this machinery from industry and getting very little for our own produce, you understand, to put it simply, that it is impossible to make ends meet.

[Reporter] There is a great discrepancy between the high cost of services, machinery and industrial equipment, high overheads, and the prices paid for crop and livestock produce. In the past, under the subsidy system farms gradually built up debts, but this did not affect the workers themselves. Leaseholders and cooperative members must pay for everything out of their own pockets and this makes for a heavy financial burden and puts many people off leaseholding. Nonetheless, it is perfectly obvious right now that leaseholding provides a tangible impetus to increasing agricultural production. This process is being hampered by the inadequacies of price system.

Government Sets New Produce Prices for 1 Jan

LD0908214790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 9 Aug 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We are now speaking more and more frequently about the need to have real masters in our economy who are able incidentally not only to handle matters skillfully, but also to earn money.

If one is speaking about the countryside, they should be helped by the USSR Government decision to introduce new state purchase prices for agricultural produce on 1 January next year. Peasants have long awaited this hour. Now they are to be paid almost a third more for sunflower, sugarbeet, cotton, linen products, tobacco, high-grade tea, livestock and poultry, and milk and cream. The prices for the remaining types of agricultural produce will be set by the republics themselves.

Scientific

Mir Cosmonauts Make Safe Return to Earth

Interviewed After Landing

LD0908212990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 9 August, in its regular Vremya newscast, broadcasts an eight-minute video report by television correspondent S. Slipchenko from the landing site of returning cosmonauts Solovyev and Balandin.

The report begins with an aerial shot of the landing module making its parachute landing, with two helicopters in close attendance.

This is followed by shots of Solovyev and Balandin, still clad in their spacesuits, being surrounded by journalists and giving their first brief interviews while seated. Slipchenko says that a large number of foreign journalists have come along due to a big stir about the cosmonauts facing defects in orbit and because it was thought by some that there might be some complications in landing.

Slipchenko asks Solovyev how everything worked. Solovyev says: "During the separation and descent, the spacecraft functioned perfectly. The unplanned snags that we had previously experienced had no effect on the structure and orientation.

"The separation took place normally."

Standing alongside the thermal insulation of the descent module, which is shown in close-up, Slipchenko says: "It was stated in the Soviet press and was then taken up by the Western press that the spacecraft in orbit had been holed in the side, that its thermal insulation had been torn off, and that landing would be practically impossible. Well this is what is termed hard thermal insulation; it covers the spacecraft and only begins working during the portion of the descent into the dense layers of the atmosphere when the spacecraft passes through a plasma state. The vacuum shield thermal insulation that the cosmonauts removed—the one that they emerged for and attempted to repair—had no effect on the descent, as

Flight Commander Aleksandr Solovyev has just said." Slipchenko is shown touching the scorched thermal insulation of the descent craft.

The video then goes on to show close-up shots of some plants grown in orbit and a bag containing film shot in space.

Slipchenko then again briefly interviews the cosmonauts and both express their readiness and happiness to go back into space in the future.

The report closes with video shots of scientists looking at live quail and plants that have been brought back from space by the cosmonauts.

Work of New Crew Detailed

LD0908215690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1308 GMT on 9 August broadcasts a four-minute report on the work of Mir Cosmonauts Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov. The report begins with special correspondent Vladimir Bezyayev saying that the crew of the seventh main expedition—the Vulcans [Vul'kany]—will work on the Mir station until December 1990.

Bezyayev interviews the flight director, Pilot Cosmonaut of the USSR Vladimir Alekseyevich Solovyev, about the work scheduled for the Vulcans: on 15 August the next Progress cargo vessel is to be launched, with docking scheduled on the 17th. This progress will be carrying quite a lot of scientific equipment and a good starting point for our technology, for our cameras, Solovyev says. This progress will be taking up very interesting equipment for the station. "We have thought out how the station's power can be most optimally and sensibly redistributed."

Solovyev says that after undocking from the station, test operations for the returnable capsule will be conducted on this cargo craft because this year it is already being planned that on the next progress cargo vessel, by means of this returnable capsule, some 200 kg of payload will be brought back to earth: these are the smelts, film cassettes, and biotechnology which will be produced. It is planned that the Vulcans will carry out two space walks—one spacewalk devoted to work on the hatch cover, the other one for building up the station's power and for turning it into an industrial works. To this end it will be necessary to install additional solar batteries. Solovyev says that flight control center staff members have begun energetically learning if not the Japanese language then at least the English language because 2 December, the day of the launch of the Japanese cosmonaut, is not far off.

Separate Return of Cargo in Future

LD0908145190 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT
9 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Solvoyev and Aleksander Balandin today returned to earth after almost six months on board the Soviet Mir orbital station.

They transferred some 130 kilograms of materials obtained during research and experiments in space.

This was the last time that a return capsule will de-orbit cosmonauts and materials together, TASS was told at the Mission Control Centre.

From now on the crew will return separately. Materials will be delivered to earth in the return capsule of a transport spacecraft. Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov, who replaced Solovyev and Balandin on board the Mir station, will be the first to test such a capsule.

The sixth expedition, Manakov and Strekalov, are expected to work at the station for 132 days. They are planning to conduct some 250 experiments, including the continuation of work on the Kristall technological module to produce high-purity crystals, and two rounds of extravehicular activities [EVA].

Use of Space Technology for Consumer Goods Viewed

LD1008003690 Moscow in English to North America
2200 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] An exhibition Conversion 90 has opened in Moscow. It displays the concrete examples of how defense and space research facilities are used for civilian needs. Our correspondent has the details:

[Unidentified correspondent] The visitors begin their inspection of the exhibition with seeing a video film on the first flight of the Soviet reusable spacecraft Buran, accomplished in 1988. Response to that event was controversial since the building of that system has cost more than R14 billion. And when will Buran justify the money invested in it? How can this be achieved? Evidently by means of using the experience gained in the building of space equipment in civilian industries, from the food industry to medicine.

Here's what the general director of the super secret center, (Vadim Isachenko), has said about exhibits at Conversion 90:

[Begin (Isachenko) recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] Here we present some of our technologies and technological equipment. These items have been patented in Japan, West Germany, and other countries. Our method of precision molding is particularly popular; it saves a lot of time and money since the parts produced in this way require no further processing.

More than 300 new technologies were worked out during the construction of Buran, two-thirds of them can be used in civilian industries—in the production of agricultural machinery and equipment for the consumer goods and the food industrial, at factories yielding synthetic fiber, at plants manufacturing medical (?outfits). Besides, work in this area made it possible to develop lately more than 170 articles for the processing industries which yield sugar, bread, meat, and milk products. More than 500 new articles, including 250 of medicine, are to be developed in the near future.

According to estimates, the use of space research technologies in consumer goods industries will yield by the year 2000 an economic effect surpassing R2 billion. [end recording]

IAEA Mission Begins Analysis in Belorussia

*LD1008093190 Moscow TASS in English 0850 GMT
10 Aug 90*

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Palchevskiy]

[Text] Minsk August 10 TASS—An International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) mission has begun its work in the city of Gomel, a regional centre in Soviet Belorussia, just 150 kilometres away from the crippled Chernobyl nuclear power station.

The main task of the mission is to carry out an independent analysis of the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster and their impact on the population of the affected regions in Belorussia, the Ukraine, and the Russian Federation.

"At the invitation of the Soviet Government, the tragedy's aftermath is being analysed by experts and scientists from 17 countries," Jiri Beranek, co-director of the IAEA mission, told TASS.

"They are examining houses, farms, hospitals, and facilities throughout the contaminated territory, taking soil and air samples, and recording comparative data."

The mission's work is being done in five main directions which include verifying the decisions taken by the Soviet side in eliminating the aftermath of the disaster and making a comprehensive evaluation of the medical situation.

Physicians will pay attention primarily to malignant tumours, thyroid gland disorders, anemia, and such psychological effects as neurosis and stress.

The results of expert examination will be published at the end of the year.

Baltic Republics

Red Army Soldiers Guard Monuments in Baltics

LD0908191290 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT
19 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius, August 9 TASS—Soviet armoured personnel carriers and armed soldiers last night guarded the monuments to Vladimir Lenin and General Ivan Chernyakhovskiy, who commanded troops that liberated the Lithuanian capital from Hitler during the Second World War.

The appearance of the military hardware and armed soldiers in downtown Vilnius fuelled tempers once again. Some regard the move as a necessary and justified measure, while others see it as an "attempt to create a conflict situation" and use military force to solve all problems.

The Lithuanian government made a public statement, saying that it "denounces the guard of the sculptures, organised by representatives of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union, and regards it as interference in the internal affairs of the Lithuanian Republic".

Jurzas Yermalavicus, head of the Ideological Department of the Lithuanian Pro-Union Communist Party Central Committee, thinks differently. "This is a forced measure," he told TASS. "We have information that nationalist-minded elements are planning to dismantle these monuments of history and culture, which are dear to every honest man," Yermalavicus said.

A veritable onslaught on monuments has been launched in Lithuania. The monument to Lenin in the centre of Vanjai, a small township in Telsaiskij district, was destroyed several weeks ago. Several days ago, the same lot befell the monument to Lenin and the commemorative sculptural group "Four Communards", installed on the site of the execution of Communists in Kaunas in 1926.

Riga, August 9 TASS—In view of the dismantling of the monuments to the founder of the Soviet state, Latvian parliament chief Anatolijs Gorbunovs was asked, in an open letter from the public, who is Lenin for him today.

"I appreciate Lenin not only for his capacity for self-criticism, but also for his impartiality in making conclusions and evaluating phenomena that continue to be relevant to this day," Gorbunovs said in his reply published in republican newspapers.

He said "immoral, primitive attempts to strike Lenin's name from history, in whatever they are epitomised and wherever they occur", were unacceptable.

"He is also for me the example of a man ready to take a decisive, irreversible step in the most difficult situation," Gorbunov noted.

Gorbunov believes that time calls for re-thinking, re-evaluating Lenin and his creativity. "In so doing, we should free ourselves of distortions and canonisation of his tenets."

Estonia's Savisaar Holds Talks With Ryzhkov

No Agreements Reached

LD1008002890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2020 GMT 9 Aug 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] As you know, Estonian Prime Minister Savisaar has had a meeting with Nikolay Ryzhkov. We telephoned the Estonian POST-PRESS today, and were told that they discussed measures to stabilize the republic's internal market, prices policy, the introduction this year of a controlled border, and also the position of the Soviet Army in Estonia. No agreement was reached on any of the issues. Savisaar is provisionally scheduled to visit Moscow again in one week.

Savisaar Interviewed on Talks

LD0908131990

[Editorial Report] Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian at 1700 GMT on 8 August carries a nine-minute recorded interview granted by Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar to correspondent Jaan Raudsepp following Savisaar's meeting in Moscow on 8 August with USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Nikolay Ryzhkov. Savisaar says that the main subjects discussed were the presence of the USSR Army on Estonian territory, protection of the domestic market, and the setting up of the all-Union Integral association. He says that on the subject of the Estonian domestic market, the Estonian decision to reduce the quantity of meat provided for the Union fund was discussed, as were plans to increase food prices in Estonia. Savisaar says that Estonian plans for both the Latvian and Russian borders—with customs points to be effected this autumn—were handed over to Ryzhkov.

In respect of the Integral association, Ryzhkov was already aware of both the Estonian Supreme Soviet's and the 5 August republics' protest resolutions, Savisaar notes. He continues: "And we indeed remained of different opinions, but what one can view as being positive, however, is that he agreed to alter the membership of the Integral to become voluntary; that is, that practically all Union-subordinated industry had to join without being consulted—it is indeed known that many Union-subordinated enterprises, be it the Ilmarine or Talleks, have expressed no wish to join the Integral, but up until now they all had to join, according to the Union directive."

Savisaar says that he was surprised that the note which had been handed to the USSR deputy foreign minister on the subject of the USSR Army presence in Estonia, to be passed on to the USSR Government, had failed to

reach Ryzhkov. Some related issues were discussed, however, including the Estonian request of the Kohtla-Järve civil defense regiment to be transferred to Estonian government control, and several plots of land in army use to be handed back to Estonia, he points out. In respect of the latter there is at present some agreement with the Baltic Military District, but none with the USSR Ministry of Defense, he notes.

Savisaar continues: "Naturally, the USSR prime minister linked several issues to the planned Union treaty, and stressed that should Estonia indeed agree to participate in the preparation of the Union treaty, then there would be one kind of attitude toward it, otherwise, it will indeed be clearly quite different."

Savisaar ends the interview by saying that he has heard of a proposal for the USSR Government to purchase oil from abroad, which demonstrates the extent of the economic crisis.

Pskov-Estonia Border Change Efforts Reviewed

90UN2493A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 27 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA special correspondent V. Pyankova: "On Attempts To Reconsider the Borders Between Pskov Oblast and Estonia: By Gifts Or By Falsification"]

[Text] Pskov Oblast—"I live in the Pechorskiy Rayon of Pskov Oblast. Estonians, our neighbors, have become very active. If you sign a paper calling for the joining of Pechorskiy Rayon to their republic you will be given a card allowing you to buy certain groceries which they still have more of than we do. Everybody knows that in 1920 the people of the Baltics, together with the Entente, chased our armies away almost as far as Pskov. For that reason our country agreed to sign the Tartu treaty—just for the sake of peace. The demarcation line separating Russia from Estonia was set then right along the trenches. That was why the Russian Pechory area ended up then on the other side of the Russian border. But in 1940 the republic joined the Union, of its own free will, and nobody even thought to argue about the borders. Due to historical and ethnographic reasons Pechory simply reentered Pskov Oblast. But now there is a whirlpool of emotions around the Pechory region. The Estonians want to retake our region again, by hook or by crook. We are quite concerned about all this.

[Signed] I. Sviridov, village of Novoizborsk, Pskov Oblast."

Unfortunately, there are reasons for the residents of Pechorskiy Rayon to be concerned, and they are rather serious. In February of this year the main Committee of Estonian citizens (a recently formed political organization; USSR People's Deputy Tiit Made, notorious for his pathological dislike of Russians, is one of its ideological inspirers and leaders) conducted the elections of delegates from the former Pechorskiy Kray (Petserimaa in

Estonian) to the so-called Estonian congress. In March the congress itself was proclaimed "not yet" the parliament but already an organization which has the moral and legal (?) right to announce the rightful wishes of the Estonian republic to the world. This congress then declared categorically that the republic restored its borders set by the Tartu treaty. It adopted the declaration "On the State Borders of Estonia" and published a special issue of the "Congress of Estonia" with a map of Estonian electoral districts. On that map Pechorskiy Rayon is included in Petserimaa as part of Estonian territory. The congress elected the Committee of Estonia, which proclaimed itself "the highest representation of state" in the republic. Finally, in May, the Estonian Supreme Soviet followed them and made the decision to go back 70 years—to the conditions and the borders set in the Tartu peace treaty. The USSR President declared all those decisions anticonstitutional and, therefore, void.

The events that are causing such concern among the local residents started quite some time ago. On 9 July last year in the village of Yachmenevo in Pskov Oblast, for instance, people from the neighboring republic tried to unveil a memorial plaque on the site of the house of one of the best-known "forest brothers"—fighters against the Soviet power. On 29 July about 200 Estonians conducted a meeting under the banner of bourgeois Estonia in the village of Umkovichi. On 23 August they were picketing the roads along the border between Pechorskiy Rayon and the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. The pickets displayed anti-Soviet slogans, and the rayon leaders had to send an official protest to Vaino Valjas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, and Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The tension, however, continued to grow. Certain activists started to pile up "historical reasons" around Pechorskiy Rayon, trying to justify the territorial claims on it. They continue to invent nonsensical theories so that they can develop some grounds for their demand, paradoxical from the historical point of view: to give native Russian lands to the republic.

On 25 January this year the newspaper VORUSSKIY VESTNIK of Voru Rayon neighboring on Pechory published the article by Aare Khyrn entitled "The National Movement on Estonian Land." It claims that in the third millennium B.C. (see how far back the diligent author went) nobody but the Finno-Ugric tribes lived in the Pechory area; and in the first millennium that area was populated entirely by the eastern tribes of the Baltic Finns. He claims that Slavic settlements appeared there quite late, approximately in the 10th century A.D., and only when the Pechory monastery was founded (it will be 517 years old this year, by the way) did the ethnographic picture of the area change as they started to send people from Russia to live there.

So this is the true story! And the Russians were naive enough to think that they spent thousands of years in

their settlements in the Pechory area and that gives them some right to continue living on this land without fighting for it again, and that, compared to this, the 20 years that their neighbors possessed the land was an aberration corrected by history itself.

At present, apart from the "card endowing" mentioned by I. Sviridov in his letter which really has taken place, they also use the crudest falsification of facts. For instance, a rumor is being spread that the majority of Pechorskiy Rayon residents simply cannot wait to hand over their land to Estonia, so far below the Russian standard of life is it in comparison with their neighbors. Is this really true?

Pskov sociologists conducted a public opinion poll in the rayon on the subject of processes in the sphere of ethnic relations. Its results were quite definite and disproved the unfounded assertions of the local residents' desire to leave Russia. Only eight percent of those polled, including seven percent of Russians and 26 percent of Estonians, gave a positive evaluation to the activity of the Committee of Estonian Citizens on the territory of the rayon; 69 percent of the residents, including 71 percent of Russians and 42 percent of Estonians, did not approve of connecting the rayon to Estonia; 23 percent did not express any opinion at all or have never even considered such a possibility. But more than half of the people from all ethnic groups admitted that there was an ethnic problem in the area and they considered it quite distressing. This was the conclusion that the sociologists drew from the poll: "If any force makes an actual effort to upset the status quo, it will inevitably result in a sharp increase in social tension, given the interethnic relations."

Let us go back to the roots of the current territorial claims. Let us open the second volume of "Memories of the Days When We Fought for Independence" published in Tallinn. The volume bears the title "The Liberation War of 1918-1920." There we find an article on "The Tartu Peace Treaty" written by A. Piyp. He is one of those who signed the Tartu peace treaty in 1920 on behalf of the Estonian Democratic Republic. He says that the representative of Russia, Kostyayev, insisted that "the Russian border never went further than the Narva river and Chudskoye Lake, whether it was at the time of the Danes, or Swedes, or Germans." And he continues that then the border had to follow the historical line that had existed since the times of the Teutonic-Livonian order and which was set by the Swedish-Russian treaty of 1617. But in 1920 Estonia, a participant of the Entente then, insisted that the trenches became the demarcation line. About that A. Piyp writes: "At the southern front the border between Estonia and Russia was set along the factual division line between the armies."

It is clear that the border set by the Tartu treaty was originally a concession on the part of the Soviet side as they tried to spare their own and other nations the unnecessary grief and deprivations of an aggression. But

now, after 70 years of totally new history, they try to present the justifiable weakness of those days as an example of historical justice. One cannot but think of a well-known Estonian doggerel that we always considered but a joke: "The Estonian border runs alongside the Chinese wall and there is no room for Russia between them."

The joke, however, is becoming an ambitious reality.

The plenum of the Pechorskiy CPSU Raykom [rayon party committee] adopted a decision on 22 February of this year "On Unlawful Actions of the Committees of Estonian Citizens on the territory of Pechorskiy Rayon, Pskov Oblast;" Pechorskiy Rayon people's deputies issued a statement on 29 March; on 31 March 1990 the session of the Pskov Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies addressed a statement to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviets of the USSR, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], and Estonia. But judging by the latest events in Estonia or by the decisions adopted there at the highest levels, the republic did not heed either of the above-mentioned appeals, or the voices of reason from people within the republic itself. Paul Lekhestik, for instance, warns in the Tartu newspaper VPERED that "whether you want it or not the problem will become crucial if the secession of Estonia from the USSR becomes a de jure and de facto reality. It is not hard to sign something. It is hard to live..." Further on he calls for the people's common sense and sense of reality as they approach the subject of the Pechory area. E. Ernits, a resident of the city of Vory and veteran of the Great Patriotic War, sent an article to PECHORSKAYA PRAVDA. He writes unequivocally about his attitude toward the campaign going at a slow but steady pace: "I am sure that the existing border between our two nations is right where it should be. I cannot approve of any religious or ethnic feuds because such feuds among people are out of place in a civilized society, as they are a sign of atavism left over from the savages."

This is quite true. We know of a number of unfortunate examples of this; do we need to add to them?

People's Front of Latvia Slated To Meet 11 Aug

LD1008085990 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian
0430 GMT 10 Aug 90

[Text] The Board of the Dome of the People's Front of Latvia invites you: Our march to true independence, to a democratic state, must not be stopped. ("Be united! Therefore, it is very interesting that) 11 August is the 70th anniversary of the peace treaty between the Republic of Latvia and Soviet Russia.

Remembering today to consider the future of Latvia and the whole Baltic region, the Board of the Dome of the People's Front of Latvia and the Latvian Citizens' Committee are arranging a joint meeting. We will gather together tomorrow, 11 August at 1700. We will come to the Freedom Monument. We will be united for Latvia.

Latvian Council Meets To Consider Land Reform*LD0908222290 Riga Domestic Service in Lithuanian
0430 GMT 9 Aug 90*

[Text] Yesterday there was a meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Latvia. It discussed the Department of Agrarian Reform, whose activity is closely connected to land reform; however, a decision on the question was postponed because the participants in the session could not agree whether this department should be subordinated to the Council of Ministers or the Ministry of Agriculture.

There also was a discussion on personal property insurance, and it was resolved to extend the range of sick children entitled to benefits. Also yesterday, the deputy ministers of agriculture were appointed: the first deputy was Andris Skele, and simply deputy was Valdis Penikis.

Latvia's Rubiks Attends Belorussia Border Talks*LD0908131190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1100 GMT 9 Aug 90*

[Text] A meeting of friendship between Latvia and Belorussia has taken place concerning the border between the republics. Rubiks, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, said at the meeting: We are well aware that our national policy is not devoid of problems. This is perfectly natural because our Union is a complex and developing socio-political organism.

A little earlier here a group of Latvians set up border posts with the Latvian coat-of-arms about 1.5 km from today's official border, thus restoring the republic's state sovereignty at the 1939 borders, the republican newspapers report. The actions of those who took part in this gave rise to an acute protest, not only in Belorussia but also among the inhabitants of neighboring republics. Rubiks also noted that the communists of the republic were angered by the irresponsibility of the leaders of the three Baltic republics, who stated on behalf of the people that the representatives of these republics do not consider it possible to take part in the process of preparing a Union treaty.

Firm Suggests Barter To Cope With Shortages*PM0808151390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 5 Aug 90*

[Report by N. Abola from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Fashion and barter. We often complain about the shortage of fashionable goods in our stores and we forget that their production is a complex process in which a great number of partners take part. If one of them drops out of this chain, this results in shortages of the goods which we require on store shelves. By we, I mean consumers, of course.

[Abola] The Latvian Clothing Association produces more than 400 modern styles of clothing annually. These are goods to suit any taste according to age and fashion-consciousness. The goods' European standard of quality has been achieved thanks to the comprehensive retooling of the enterprise with imported equipment. There is no denying that these styles would meet the requirements of even the most demanding of consumers. Having spent 11 million rubles on reconstruction, the association is capable of largely satisfying republican demand for clothing articles. However, the stores are by no means overflowing with goods. One of the enterprise's most serious problems, which is currently becoming paramount, is the shortage of fabrics. Latvia's traditional supplier—Russia—did not take part in the textile industry wholesale fair this year.

Our women would gladly buy any of the styles which we have seen here today. They are made from good-quality fabrics varied as to their color and texture. Fabrics are currently a big problem, there is a shortage of them. How do you propose to resolve this problem?

[R.S. Kuzovkova, chief engineer of the Latvian Association] I would like to propose the following solution: Textile enterprises producing fabrics for our range could conclude a barter contract with us, that is, in return for fabrics in which we are interested they could obtain all types of our output for their workers. At the same time I would like to suggest that enterprises which produce similar output to ours could buy any of our styles including the full range of technical documentation.

[Announcer] These proposals deserve attention, after all, the Latvian firm is a reliable partner.

Vilnius Issues Statement on Talks With Russia*LD0908204690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian
1920 GMT 9 Aug 90*

[Text] Today the information service of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania published through ELTA channels a statement which says that last week, during the working meetings in Moscow and Tallinn of the delegation headed by Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene, the rapprochement of the positions of the heads of the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation became apparent. However, the spheres of competence and influence in the newly formed Union have not yet been defined.

At present two commissions are working simultaneously evolving a concept of the Union's transition to the market. On the instruction of Gorbachev and Yeltsin, a joint working group has been set up, and also a group to further improve the government variant of this concept submitted by USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Ryzhkov.

The Government of the Republic of Lithuania regards as acceptable in such a situation contacts among all partners who have at their disposal resources of interest to

the Republic and who are able to establish mutually advantageous partnership relations. At the same time, the attitude to possible partners must be differentiated. First, it is expedient to conclude agreements only with those partners who are able to provide sufficient guarantees that the agreements signed by them will be adhered to.

The statement says that after the preparatory talks of the government of the Republic of Lithuania with the leaders of Russia, it is expected that a delegation of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers will come in the middle of August to Vilnius to sign an agreement on economic cooperation. In the opinion of the government of the Republic of Lithuania, by that time the independence of Lithuania will be fully recognized by the Russian Federation and the RSFSR Council of Ministers could then adopt a corresponding document recognizing the Republic of Lithuania.

By the autumn a group dealing with the principles of the transition of the Soviet Union to a market economy would conclude its work. An agreement on economic cooperation among the republics and on the all-Union market would be most likely consolidated by a political agreement on a federation, confederation, or commonwealth of new states.

The government of the Republic of Lithuania considers that before the signing of these political documents, at the negotiations of Lithuania with the Soviet Union, the RSFSR, and other members of the present USSR, it is essential to sign agreements recording and confirming the status of the Republic of Lithuania as an independent state.

The text of this statement will be published in the press.

Lithuanian Supreme Council Bans Popular Tabloid

LD1008084690 Vilnius International Service
in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] The Secretariat of the Union of Lithuanian Journalists has published a statement disagreeing with a decision by the Lithuanian Supreme Council Presidium to halt the publication of the newspaper DVIDESIMT KAPEIKU. We have reported already that the Supreme Council leadership passed such a decision, and I quote: bearing in mind society's concern and wishes. In the decision, the DVIDESIMT KAPEIKU newspaper and some other publications are said to be of an amoral nature and to violate the norms of morality. It should be noted that DVIDESIMT KAPEIKU is the most popular tabloid in Lithuania.

Following the Supreme Council Presidium's decision to temporarily ban it, there has been dissatisfaction among a part of the public and among journalists. The leadership of the Union of Lithuanian Journalists says, among other things, that by adopting this decision the Supreme Council Presidium exceeded its powers because the new

press law provides for a completely different mechanism for halting and banning publications.

Lithuanian Communist Party Adopts Guidelines

90UN2349C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
22 Jun 90 p 2

[Unattributed article: "In the Name of an Independent, Democratic Lithuania"]

[Text] As we have already reported, the 5th Plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee took place on 16 June. It discussed and evaluated the political and economic situation in the republic as well as the situation in the party, and it approved the guidelines "On the Main Trends in Lithuanian Communist Party Activities Under Current Conditions."

In the realm of politics the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee first and foremost affirms its own evaluation of the 11 March Act. Our document says that the declaration of an independent Lithuanian state is an indisputable and irreversible act manifesting the historical self-determination of the people of Lithuania as well as a source of genuine democracy and the basis of democracy's preconditions.

But, it is further noted, the restoration of Lithuanian statehood is a process which requires a transitional period. The Lithuanian Communist Party supports all steps by the leadership and the government of the republic to resolve the problems of negotiations with the USSR and to halt the economic blockade, which we condemn as an attempt to put the negotiating parties in deliberately unequal positions.

The Lithuanian Communist Party believes that a stable, independent economy is a basis of independence. However, radical economic reform should be carried out consistently and gradually with regard to the fact of the inclusion of Lithuania's national economy in the economic structure of the USSR.

It is stated in the document that the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee opposes attempts to base a policy of restoring independence solely on the spiritual readiness of the people of Lithuania for self-sacrifice. It is also necessary to take into account the material aspect of this problem and to try to avoid a significant worsening in people's economic and social position.

The document goes on to say that achievement of interethnic harmony is a necessary condition for stabilization of the internal situation. And this requires the immediate creation of legal guarantees to protect the rights and legal interests of all people residing in Lithuania and conditions for those who wish to retain Soviet citizenship.

In its political activities the Lithuanian Communist Party is guided and will continue to be guided by the

principle of pluralism of opinion. "Our goal," the document says, "is an independent and purely democratic Lithuania in which the right to personal freedom may be realized without any limitations and independent of nationality and views."

In its foreign policy the Lithuanian Communist Party intends in the future to support and develop ties with European socialist, Social Democratic, Eurocommunist, and other progressive parties as well as with all the democratic forces of the USSR in order, first and foremost, to contribute to the real affirmation of Lithuanian independence. Direct state ties with the republics of the USSR are also necessary with the goal of halting and eliminating the effects of the blockade.

In the realm of economics and the social sphere the basic guideline for the activity of the Lithuanian Communist Party is economic reform and transition to the market. The document says that in order to hasten this process, legislative activities to form a new economic system and guarantee its real functioning should be accelerated.

The Lithuanian Communist Party believes that a necessary condition of economic reform is the creation of a system of social protections with the goal of absorbing the negative effects of reform on people, especially on those with low incomes.

The document states that the Lithuanian Communist Party supports a variety of forms of property and believes that denationalization and privatization of current state and collective farms should take place on a voluntary basis with their transformation into peasant farms, cooperatives, joint-stock companies, agricultural firms, associations, etc. The Lithuanian Communist Party also considers it most important to conduct land reform on a voluntary basis. First and foremost, that land must be allotted to those who work in agriculture.

The Lithuanian Communist Party proposes that all the most important laws on the legal provision of socioeconomic reform be presented for general discussion and be adopted with consideration for the opinions and interests of the majority of Lithuania's population. The document states that the Lithuanian Communist Party is taking upon itself the initiative of helping to prepare a law on land reform.

In the realm of party life the most important guideline is the further reform of the party, its transformation into a parliamentary party, its reorganization, and the creation of new structural ties "from below"—from the primary party organizations. The document says that the Lithuanian Communist Party, while preparing itself for the upcoming congress which is designated for autumn of this year, will support the initiative of communists, their groups, and the primary and territorial organizations to form alternative concepts of party program guidelines and basic directions for its activities.

In the restructuring of the forms and methods of the work of party organizations, priority must be given to

discussion, dialogue, political measures and civil actions. We must cooperate more actively with other parties, trade unions, and youth, women's and other public organizations of Lithuania.

The document especially stipulates guidelines for the activities of the members of the Lithuanian Communist Party elected as deputies of the republic's Supreme Council and the self-management councils: To explain the position of the Lithuanian Communist Party more bravely and boldly when choosing real ways and means of affirming Lithuania's independence; and to coordinate its activities to defend social justice, guiding itself by the principles formulated in the Lithuanian Communist Party Program. One of the most important tasks of the work of party committees at all levels and their commissions and primary party organizations is to inform the deputies about conditions at the local level and help them search for ways of resolving urgent problems.

The document says that in order to possess a sufficient social base and rally its ranks in the name of the creation of a genuinely independent and democratic Lithuania, the party should define specific positions on the day's most important questions and implement them through practical activity.

Lithuanian Six-Month Economic Performance Noted

904A0502A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
12 Jul 90 p 2

[Report by the Department of Statistics: "On the Economic State of Lithuania"]

[Text] Presented here are the main results of the development of the Lithuanian economy in the first half of this year. This is a special period, since the processes of economic and social development in Lithuania took place under abnormal conditions, i.e., conditions of economic blockade. In spite of the fact that 16 April is formally considered to mark the beginning of the blockade, studies conducted in March by the Department of Statistics concerning production and delivery agreements with USSR enterprises and organizations show that, in essence, the blockade began significantly earlier.

Enterprise activity was influenced primarily by the provision of material and energy resources. Shortfalls from allocated quotas consisted of the following (not delivered to Lithuania): 87,000 tons of metal (22 percent of the half-year quota), 20,000 tons of steel conduit (34 percent), 5,200 tons of cast iron water piping (41 percent), 255,000 cubic meters of commercial timber (65 percent), 9,000 gas stoves (82 percent), over 3,000 tons of caustic soda (52 percent), 3,800 tons of soda ash (25 percent), 40 million square meters of cardboard packaging (37 percent), 5,300 tons of writing paper (46 percent), 15,000 tons of cellulose (28 percent), 468 tractors of various makes (55 percent), spare parts for agricultural

machinery, tractors, and vehicles amounting to 9 million rubles (32 percent), and many other material resources.

Energy. In the first half of the year, 8.051 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical energy and 9.304 million gigacalories of thermal energy were supplied to Lithuanian consumers. This is less than what was delivered over the same period last year and comprises 85.7 and 79.5 percent of the half-yearly demand.

Industry. In the first half of the year, production shortfall from contractual agreement amounted to 265.4 million rubles [R]. Almost the entire volume of undelivered production is attributable to the second quarter—R256.2 million, including 169.7 million in June.

Consumer goods (except alcoholic beverages) manufactured in the first half-year period amounted to R130 million, or 3.1 percent less than last year, and food products (not including alcoholic beverages)—R131 million, or 8.5 percent less than last year. This production decrease is attributable essentially to May and June.

In the first half of this year, for all categories of economic enterprises, 1,354,200 tons of milk were purchased, or 15,200 tons (one percent) less than for the first half of last year; 411.9 million fewer eggs (three percent), or R14.7 million less. Meat and poultry purchases amounted to 345,900 tons, or 1,700 tons (0.5 percent) more. Meat and poultry social enterprises sold three percent less, milk enterprises—six percent less, while inhabitants provided significantly more—11,400 tons (27 percent) and 36,400 tons (eight percent), respectively.

In the first half of the year, USSR consumers were supplied with 72,500 tons of meat and meat products (converted to meat), and 511,100 tons of milk and dairy products (converted to milk). This is 10,500 and 78,900 tons less, respectively, than what was envisaged in the state requisition. Over the same period, deliveries of these products to the republic market increased—meat, by 6,300 tons (eight percent); sausage, by 1,000 tons (four percent); canned meats, by 611,000 conventional cans (22 percent); whole milk products, by 18,900 tons (five percent); cheese, by 847 tons (15 percent); and butter, by 551 tons (four percent).

With initiation of the blockade, shipments of certain varieties of food products out of the USSR by market allocations were significantly reduced. For this reason, shipments in the first half of the year as compared with the same period of 1989 constituted: for sugar—18,400 tons (35 percent) less, margarine—844 tons (23 percent) less, canned fruits and vegetables—4.8 million conventional cans (eight percent) less, eggs—9.1 million (three percent) fewer, vegetable oil—116 tons (three percent) less.

Deputy Explains Lithuanian Foreign Policy

AU0808135990 Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 1 Aug 90 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Czeslaw Okinczyc, Lithuanian parliamentary deputy, by Jerzy Marek Nowakowski; place and date of interview not given: "A Conversation: The Difficulties in Maintaining Independence"]

[Excerpts] [Nowakowski] I understand that the Poles in Lithuania have proposed that a Polish Soviet Republic be established. What is all this about? After all, the very name "Soviet Poland" sends shivers down one's spine.

[Okinczyc] To say that the Poles have submitted such a proposal is an insult to the Poles in Lithuania. There is a concrete person behind the idea: Mr. Jan Ciechanowicz. You know very well who he is. There are still a few Polish activists who support him, and they are counting on the Kremlin using Polish hands to crush Lithuanian independence and that they will be able to further their own careers as a result.

That Mr. Ciechanowicz elaborates his views in the columns of "YEDINSTVO" is in itself already very telling. Both the organization and publication are a forum for all those to whom monuments to Lenin are dear and who consider the Lithuanian emblem and national colors a thorn in their sides.

The idea of "Soviet Poland" smacks of provocation. What Deputy Ciechanowicz has thought up is that a plebiscite will be held in the territories, to quote him, "seized by Stalin in 1939," and the plebiscite will result in the establishment of an "eastern Polish Republic that is part of the USSR." [passage omitted]

[Nowakowski] Apart from being a Polish deputy in the parliament, you are, perhaps first and foremost, a Lithuanian politician and deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet Foreign Affairs Commission. What is your view of the direction of Lithuanian policy in the future?

[Okinczyc] A lot of myths and misunderstandings surround this topic in Lithuania itself. So, I would like to begin by making it clear that I am speaking on my own behalf, privately and not officially. At the present time much depends on talks with the Kremlin. There is a real danger of another blockade, one that might be more thorough than the previous one, if there is no compromise. However, I think that the Lithuanians are determined enough, so that even this kind of threat will not curb their aspirations for independence.

What will happen next? I think that maintaining independence will be more difficult than actually winning it. There is no doubt that we will have to find some kind of way of coexisting with the Soviet Union. The difference will be that it will tend to be cooperation with individual republics rather than with the center itself. The extent of economic ties between our states is so great that it is hard to imagine them being broken off overnight. Poland will

also have a very important role in Lithuania's future foreign policy. Poland will most probably be Lithuania's main window to the West. This creates a great opportunity for improving mutual relations and wiping out the prejudices that go back many years. I do not believe that strongly in Lithuania forming some kind of close association with Scandinavia. Our interests are too divergent. It would, of course, be a good thing if another Hanseatic League were to be established, but that is just political day-dreaming for the time being.

I also think that Lithuania should be a neutral country that remains outside the great blocs. Small states that do not lie on the main thoroughfares of history do best in a neutral role. Finally, there is one more thing. Actually, I should have begun with it. My hopes for the building of a bridge between Lithuanians and Poles is based on a belief in the development of democracy. Good local government laws and the development of local democracy are the best cure for nationalism. It is obvious that everything that I have talked about is barely in its initial stages. However, the direction that Lithuania has opted for regarding change provides hope and creates opportunities for realizing this, I admit, optimistic vision.

RSFSR

Russia Declares Union Economic Deals Invalid

LD0908141790 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 9 Aug 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS—In order to protect the interests of the Russian Federation, the presidium of the Russian parliament today adopted a decree invalidating foreign economic agreements and deals for the sale of some strategic resources. The decree mentions specifically diamonds, precious and other metals, oil, gas, uranium and other strategic resources and products extracted or manufactured on Russian territory and sold without permission following the adoption of the declaration on state sovereignty of the Russian Federation. The decree was adopted at a presidium meeting here today.

The authors of the decree proceed from the provision of the declaration which proclaimed the republic's sovereignty over resources extracted from its territory. The declaration was adopted by the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation last June.

The decree drawn up by the republic's government says that the Russian Federation has no obligations regarding these resources and goods, concluded without the consent of the appropriate authorities.

Members of the presidium instructed the republic's government to look into the concluded deals. It should inform foreign partners that only deals coordinated with the republic's legislative and executive bodies will be regarded as valid.

Explaining the need for the urgent adoption of the decree, Sergey Shakhrai, chairman of the Russian parliament's committee on legislation, emphasized that union agencies continue to export resources extracted on the territory of the Russian Federation without informing republican bodies of these deals.

Yeltsin Visits Bashkir, Tatar ASSR

Visits Nuclear Power Station

LD0908191890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 9 Aug 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's trip to the Tatar Republic is continuing. On 7 August he visited the construction site of the Tatar nuclear power station, and late yesterday evening we received a report on this event. Here it is:

[L. Buktseytn] From on board a helicopter he viewed the construction site and together with the managers of the station and the construction site he visited the station's No. 1 generating set. Here he had a long conversation with workers, and representatives of public organizations. There was a discussion of the future fate of the construction project and the station itself. After all, many of the republic's inhabitants are expressing their opposition to its construction. [video shows various installations under construction and Yeltsin touring site and conversing with workers]

This same problem arose during Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's conversations with the workers and engineers of the Kamaz factory and other enterprises in the town of Naberezhnyye Chelny and at a meeting with people's deputies of all levels. [video shows Yeltsin speaking with workers]

Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin toured the construction site of the Yelabuga car factory.

'Ambitious' Tour Assessed

LD0908142190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0450 GMT 9 Aug 90

[From the "Panorama" program]

[Text] As promised, we will tell you about an event which is, I think, of interest to many people. The fourth day of the trip by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet around the country began today. He is now in Tataria. Sergey Omelchenko, our special correspondent, reports:

Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has already covered hundreds of kilometers in Tataria. There have been brief stopovers to see enterprises and farms. There have been meetings with town and countryside dwellers, those in charge and rank-and-file workers, representatives of various currents and movements in this autonomous

republic. The goal of the trip is rather ambitious—it is as though Yeltsin wishes to see everything, to meet everyone and chat with them.

This fragmented, compressed itinerary, and the cursory acquaintanceship with things has the same and every day: the chairman has a thorough meeting with experts, Soviet leaders, the aktiv of towns and rayons.

Yesterday, Yeltsin toured town of Naberezhnyye Chelny, had a chat with its inhabitants. Subsequently he visited Chelninskiy cardboard and paper combine, a modern production enterprise groaning under the heavy burden of R170 million debt. What is to be done to avoid bankruptcy in these new economic conditions? Many Russian enterprises are facing this question, and the head of the Russian parliament has to provide answers to this question.

At the Kamaz works the problems are altogether different—the motor vehicle association is becoming a joint-stock company, and here there are more issues to do with expansion, though there is a metal problem, numerous welfare problems, above all, of course, to do with housing.

Boris Nikolayevich tries to get to the bottom of all problems, to sum up everything that is adding to the heavy burden of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation—the long-running saga of construction of the Yelabuga motor vehicle works, the demand to halt the construction of the Tatar nuclear electric power station, and the issues of Tataria's sovereignty. In my view, this trip helps him understand things properly, on the spot, to appraise what is taking place, to make correct and, what is the main thing, timely decisions.

Now for the itinerary for today for the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation: Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin will visit Kazan today. He will visit an aviation enterprise, meet with those representing art unions of Tataria, chat with the lecturers and students of Kazan University, and meet with people's deputies and representatives of public organizations and movements of the republic.

Third Day of Tataria Visit

PM0908144590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Aug 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent N. Morozov: "Difficult Dialogue. B. Yeltsin's Tour of Tatar ASSR"]

[Text] The tour of the Tatar ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] by B. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, is into its third day. The autonomous republic's mass media are providing extensive coverage of the numerous meetings between the head of the Russian parliament and labor collectives and public representatives.

Although the Tatar ASSR's working people have things to demonstrate and show the guest, who is paying his first trip to the region, the route is by no means covering the "high" spots—Almetyevsk's boreholes, the Tatar nuclear power station, whose construction has been suspended, the Nizhnekamsk petrochemical giants where environmental alarm bells are ringing, and the Kamaz truck plant with its global problems... Although outwardly the meetings with people are taking place in an atmosphere of benevolence, the dialogue has been difficult. It is being conducted on the eve of an important political event in the republic—the Supreme Soviet session, whose agenda includes the question of state sovereignty for the Tatar ASSR. The autonomous republic is a ferment of debate. For that reason people are as often interested in the opinion of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman on independence for the autonomous republic.

B. Yeltsin said the following in an interview published in SOVETSKAYA TATARIYA: "I will repeat once again what I said at the Congress of People's Deputies: The formation of a share of power must happen from below—from the city to the republic. We will welcome whatever independence the Tatar ASSR chooses for itself."

Then:

"I will say: If you want to govern yourselves completely, go ahead... I think that the Russian parliament will be a major defender of those rights that the Tatar ASSR delegates to Russia."

During virtually every conversation with B. Yeltsin and M. Shaymiyev, chairman of the Tatar ASSR Supreme Soviet, who is accompanying the guest on his tour, people of course inquired as to when the food situation will improve. After all, the abundance of food that the guest was shown in Almetyevsk's "Dary Prirody" ["Gifts of Nature"] store does not reflect the overall picture with regard to the food supply. It is no coincidence that one of the city's inhabitants screamed angrily: "Things have been put on the shelves for your arrival, but we are simply unable to trade in our meat coupons!"

"The republic's inhabitants expect the head of the Russian parliament to see our pain, alarm, and worries behind the warmth of our traditional hospitality," B. Galiyev, a driver from Naberezhnyye Chelny, said. "We will remember his visit, but we will also remember the stock of trust he enjoys..."

Background on Visit to Tataria

PM0908144190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Aug 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Alyans Sabirov: "B. Yeltsin's Working Tour of Russia"]

[Text] Kazan—B.N. Yeltsin arrived in the Tatar Republic 6 August. The chairman of the RSFSR

Supreme Soviet has started a tour of the oblasts, krais, and republics of the Volga Region, the Urals, Siberia, and the Far East.

The first meetings were with the working people of Almetyevsk, Naberezhnyye Chelny, and Kazan. This region—where the Volga, Kama, Belaya, and Vyatka Rivers meet—is experiencing turbulent development. Industrial giants, including chemical giants, are growing up here. There is particular concern about the construction of the AES [nuclear electric power station], which a powerful antinuclear lobby is protesting against. Many problems awaiting urgent resolution have built up. It must be assumed that an important part of the meetings and talks will be given over to the nationalities issue. The local press has publicized several versions of the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of the Tatar ASSR. This point is included on the agenda of the second session of the republic's Supreme Soviet. And the other day a CPSU oblast committee [obkom] plenum adopted a resolution approving the idea of enhancing the constitutional status.

"Without violating the RSFSR's integrity, and taking account of the special historical, economic, cultural, and other ties with Russia's peoples," M. Shaymiyev, first secretary of the party obkom and chairman of the Tatar ASSR Supreme Soviet, stressed, "we must establish treaty-based relations with Russia, defining the division of powers on a number of positions of mutual interest. Thus, the declaration will not only proclaim Tataria's sovereignty but will also define in general terms the principles and mechanism for its implementation with a union of sovereign states."

Moreover, it cannot fail to be taken into account that only a small number of Tatars live in the republic. Millions of them have long inhabited many parts of the Volga and Urals, and various places of Russia and the entire Soviet Union. That is why national sovereignty cannot be restricted to administrative borders. This should also be a wide-ranging cultural and ethnic autonomous entity for the Tatar people, which—contrary to popular opinion—will by no means divide, but consolidate and strengthen Russia. Good-will, patriotism, and the coordination of positions are likely to make the process of nations' self-determination unifying rather than destructive, and recreate our multinational federation on a democratic basis, bringing it to a higher level in tune with the spirit of the times.

Concludes Tataria Tour

LD0908215190 Moscow TASS in English 1901 GMT
9 Aug 90

[Text] Kazan August 9 TASS—President of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin today met Kazan art intellectuals to discuss ways to develop the national economy, science and culture of the Tatar Autonomous Republic. This was the last meeting held by Yeltsin during his four-day visit to the republic.

"People of Tataria have vast creative potential," Yeltsin told participants in the meeting. "We become confirmed in this opinion during visits to plants and factories, oil and gas works, fields and farms to meet the urban and rural population."

The programme for the transition to sovereignty is being actively discussed in the republic, and the republic's fate should be decided, first and foremost, by its residents and their deputies, rather than by the Russian parliament, Yeltsin said.

If the programme had been implemented three years ago, inter-ethnic conflicts in the country could have been avoided, he said.

"I am glad that the people of Tataria understand that we have common troubles and common interests. Russians and Tatars, like other peoples, have been together for ages. Now we should develop these relations by a mutually regulated and mutually advantageous federal treaty.

"For example, you have grown a rich harvest. We are not going to take it away. Take what you need for seed, fodder, accounts with farmers and sell the rest at profitable prices," Yeltsin said.

There is another issue: For several years, the Tatar Republic suffered from droughts and many farms have debts to the state. Farmers are not to blame for the debts, and it is necessary to think about how to cancel them, he said.

Yeltsin informed the meeting about the modernisation of former state structures of Russia.

Yeltsin will next visit Ufa.

Arrives in Bashkiria

LD1008081190 Moscow TASS in English 0739 GMT
10 Aug 90

[By TASS correspondent Raul Tukhvatullin]

[Text] Ufa August 10 TASS—Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin arrived today in Bashkiria on the fourth day of his tour of the Russian Federation.

Unlike leaders of past years, he arrived on board a scheduled Aeroflot flight and was taken to the hotel on a small bus. There was neither the customary cavalcade of black government limousines nor the traditional escort of militia and security service cars. Nothing was out of the ordinary.

Bashkiria is the first autonomous republic in the Russian Federation to be set up by Lenin's decree in March 1919, when the civil war still raged in the country.

Today Bashkiria boasts highly developed chemistry, energy, machine-building industries and mechanised agriculture.

The republic is tenth and third in Russia in terms of industrial and agricultural production respectively.

However, mistakes have been made in its economic and social development, and huge efforts are to be taken to rectify them.

One of the main problems is that of nationalities. Some four million people, representing more than 70 nationalities, live here. Therefore one of the most important goals is perfecting relations between nationalities.

During his stay in the autonomous republic, Yeltsin will visit the Bashkir nuclear power station—the focus of powerful public protests—the Neftekamsk plant producing dump trucks, and Sterlitamak, the centre of the republic's chemical industry.

Yeltsin also plans to meet residents of Ufa, the capital city of Bashkiria, and intellectuals.

Yeltsin Interviewed on Latvia Visit, Future

PM0908132590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 90 pp 1-2

[Interview with B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by A. Olbik; place and date of interview not given: "Boris Yeltsin: It Is Still Possible To Believe in Russia"]

[Text] Riga—Many people are asking what the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet did on vacation in Latvia. I can state most definitely that Boris Nikolayevich, as though verifying his physical strength, played tennis for 60-90 minutes and went for a 10 km walk along the shore of the Gulf of Riga almost every day. At the same time he also met with statesmen of the three Baltic republics and the residents of Jurmala.

He himself assessed his stay in Latvia as follows:

"My meetings, particularly with Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet, highlighted, as it were, the prospect of our further relations. I am talking about an all-embracing treaty—in the political, economic, and social spheres, with a section on interethnic relations, and, of course, in the area of cultural ties. That is, it will be an equitable agreement between two sovereign states. And, although we sent letter-proposals to all 14 republics, it must, however, be borne in mind that the first discussion of this topic took place prior to our official appeals.

"I also had a conversation with the leaders of the three states—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. And we discussed questions of bilateral treaties with Russia. I am convinced that consultations on such a level will promote the active easing of tension on the part of the center and tension in general—outside and inside the Baltic states themselves. The treaty must be ratified more quickly—within four to six weeks."

[Olbik] How will this fit in with the USSR president's not very enthusiastic attitude, to put it mildly, toward the Baltic?

[Yeltsin] You get the impression that Gorbachev has not thought everything through properly in this sense. Maybe he is very busy... He evidently believes that Russia's proposal for treaties with the Baltic region is that very "creeping" separatism of which so much has been spoken and written.

We do not want either to elevate ourselves or to abase ourselves, we want one thing: a calm, mutually advantageous partnership. What is incomprehensible about the fact that Russia intends to conclude treaties with such sovereign Baltic states? For we have gotten really close to concluding a treaty with Britain and are negotiating with the United States and Japan. Why can we not do this with our good old neighbors?

[Olbik] Boris Nikolayevich, the very word "treaty" conjures up concepts such as mutual advantage, independent partnership, and equality of rights in realizing the letter and spirit of the agreement. But this is what is of concern: Russia is a rich country and can give Latvia (or any other state) an inestimable raw material "top-up" from its own treasures. But what can Latvia give Russia?

[Yeltsin] You understand, in normal relations, not slave ones, any country—even the poorest one—can be an indispensable partner in interstate relations. And yet Latvia (and the Baltic region in general) is certainly not an underdeveloped province but a state with a highly developed industry. It has a traditionally lofty culture—which is dearer than gold in our time—and a rich scientific and technical potential. Add to this also tourism, vacations, your light industry, the radio engineering sector, subassemblies, and so forth. And all this in quality form. Latvia has a highly developed agro-industrial complex, and in the future, I believe, Russia will be able to ease the strain with sales of surplus food. This can certainly happen if dynamic market relations triumph. So there are quite a lot of interests uniting our countries. We do not want the role of some kind of philanthropists—no, we want to be on equal terms. I propose that our treaty relations will be built in two stages. It is not yet a question of world prices for raw materials or equipment, but everything will be cleared up only when we sit around the negotiating table.

[Olbik] What will you do if the country's president announces a blockade of Latvia?

[Yeltsin] I have a sharply negative attitude toward an economic blockade, as I have already said and written to Gorbachev. With regard to Lithuania it is a major political mistake. For there was not such a blockade against Hungary, Czechoslovakia, or the GDR. And this is right. If a people strives for independence, you cannot restrain them by force. And the more pressure the authorities exert, the stronger the people's resistance will be. In our own Russia an analogous situation is taking shape with certain autonomous republics. But we will

operate not by means of pressure and threats but by means of negotiations, giving unconditional consent to the sovereignty of autonomy. Let the republic itself decide within what limits it will really be able to realize its independence.

[Olbig] Boris Nikolayevich, I wish to return to the First Congress of Russian People's Deputies. For it was a dramatic situation...

[Yeltsin] A few hours before the election of the chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet M.S. Gorbachev gathered together 250 communists and people's deputies and began suggesting to them that they prevent Yeltsin's election by any means. And with that behest he set off for Canada.

The next day I was elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet. So my opponents remained true to themselves: They did everything possible to "promote" my nomination through their clumsy actions. After such magnificent publicity I simply could not fail to win.

[Olbig] It turns out that the apparatus is so poor in "generals" that, apart from Vlasov and Polozkov, there was no one to set against you, was there?

[Yeltsin] It was not even a case of this. Fear created panic and chaotic moves. They realized full well that, if Yeltsin succeeded to power, he would begin with what I really did then begin with: with sovereignty, the separation of administrative functions, depoliticization, and so forth. Previously their main sore was Lithuania and the Baltic region as a whole, and now the headache of Russia has been added. You cannot blockade Russia, while it itself could blockade anyone... Only it would never do so.

[Olbig] Boris Nikolayevich, your withdrawal from the party could have caused a "mutiny" in the camp of the conservatives, including the conservatives on the Russian Supreme Soviet. You took a step which might have had truly catastrophic consequences for you...

[Yeltsin] You are right, there was a risk, and quite a big one. I really was most concerned about whether I would be understood correctly or lose the trust of Supreme Soviet and Congress deputies. For the majority in parliament maintains an easily upset equilibrium, and so I really did not know how deputies would take my statement at the 28th party congress. Well, I knew how the democrats would take it, but I was worried about the others. Incidentally, a certain predominance of conservative-minded deputies of the Russian Supreme Soviet did not prevent it from adopting a number of strong decisions of importance. I would say, to Russia's destiny. I believe that the First Congress of Russian People's Deputies was far more effective and radical than all three Congresses of USSR Deputies.

On 12 July I announced my withdrawal from the party, and on 13 July I was to conduct a Supreme Soviet session. I thought that that day would be lost for me and for the deputies in general. There is no denying that the

strain on the nerves was terrible. Then I entered the hall, and... applause! I was even taken aback, not expecting such a reception. And everything that I had not hoped of doing at all on that day happened.

[Olbig] Tell me, Boris Nikolayevich, was your withdrawal from the CPSU a personal psychological and ideological turning point for you?

[Yeltsin] I believed that the Supreme Soviet chairman could not be the servant of two masters—the people in the person of parliamentarians, and the party, whose interests most frequently did not coincide with the people's. The chairman must be an absolutely independent person in order to work only in the name of the voters' interests. People cite me the example of foreign presidents, who represent the interests of one party or another. This is the point—"one or another," not a single, monopoly party. Abroad, in democratic countries, a struggle is waged for influence, and whoever is more fair, clever, and energetic in the eyes of the people ends up "in the saddle." And yet in our country presidents were set up—Brezhnev, Podgornyy... Whose interests did they defend? Of course, the interests of those who set them up. The people had nothing to do with it, as it were, and no one asked them. For the time being the CPSU has renounced power only de jure, while de facto it remains at the helm. And this will be the case for a long time, until the newly created parties become strong. And so all talk of a multiparty system is paying lip service to the times rather than being a fait accompli. Tell me, which party, other than the CPSU, will be able to influence the Army, the KGB, and administrative structures? The party's monopoly remains and will, unfortunately, remain for more than a year or two... True, this will depend on how quickly processes take place in the party itself. In any case, the past congresses did not give us such hope. So no general reconstruction of the party house took place. Of course, they touched up the plaster and cleaned things up in places, but the same democratic centralism remained—something immobile and not susceptible to being reformed. I wish to emphasize once again that I must fulfill the will not of the party or of Polozkov but only the will and mandate of my voters, of the entire people! That is all! This is the paramount principle.

[Olbig] Pardon me, are you the only party member, i.e. former party member, in your family?

[Yeltsin] Ours is a politicized family. My son-in-law Valeriy was the first to take this step. Lesha, my second son-in-law, was recently admitted to candidate membership of the CPSU. True, on admission he expressed his disagreement with the existing situation in the party. I do not know whether he will get beyond candidate membership... My wife is still pondering, and she is right to do so, for such decisions have to be made independently...

[Olbig] Society is more or less familiar with your election program. But doubts are being voiced as to whether,

because you are not an economist, you will be capable of raising up the collapsed national economy in Russia.

[Yeltsin] Tell me, was Reagan an economist? And where did the concept of "Reaganomics" come from? It is not a matter of my education but, rather, of how I store up everything new and take it on board. Honestly speaking, I have gone quite deeply into economics. In general, I have something to say here.

A group exists to draw up alternative economic programs. Very radical, interesting, and in some ways modernistic for us. And we have decided to include the Russian program in one of them. The newspapers have already written about a 500-day transition to economic reform. Stage by stage and without lowering the people's living standards. I have met with this group and seen for myself what strong intellects are involved in it. They are mainly young, talented scientists who have studied world experience of economic transformations—in the United States, Japan, South Korea, and other countries. True, this program does have one shortcoming or, rather, a special feature: It is necessary to realize it with a single monetary unit. So we have made a certain correction geared to Russia. We have made one of this group's members—Grigoriy Alekseyevich Yavlinskiy—responsible for this reform. It is up to him.

We do not yet intend to introduce our own monetary unit on the territory of Russia. And so I wrote to M.S. Gorbachev from Jurmala, suggesting beginning the reform with Russia—in accordance with its program. And preparing a Union program on the basis of the concept of the Russian program—for which he and I must select a group of economists of the highest intellect who think in nonstandard ways.

And the president and I approved such an assignment. The deadline is 1 September this year.

In addition, our Supreme Soviet has structures which are tackling the elaboration of cardinal solutions to economic problems. I mean the Economic Council created higher up. But there is also another public structure which engages in forecasting, as it were, between the spheres of the Higher Economic Council, the Russian Supreme Soviet, and its chairman. This is a very promising organ with a wide range of intellectual questing. Hence its name—the Coordinating-Consultative Council, which keeps track of the consequences of any adopted decision. We would not want to repeat the mistakes when all economic policy is handed over to one person or one group of people. Look at Abalkin. He is a very clever, knowledgeable scientist, but he alone sets the tone. And a single mistake of his is reproduced throughout the country's population.

In all, the Coordinating-Consultative Council is to include 25 specialists in different areas and several compatriots living abroad, who have already offered Russia their services.

[Olbig] And Leontyev too?

[Yeltsin] Leontyev, Bunich, Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhov, Yemelyanov, Zaslavskaya, Shatalin, Soros, Shmelev, Nit, Medvedev, and a number of hands-on economists.

[Olbig] Does this mean that it will take Russia 500 days to "break in" the market economy? Is there already any specific decision aimed at improving the economy?

[Yeltsin] I have just signed in Jurmala the "Harvest-90" appeal to citizens of Russia and approved an RSFSR Council of Ministers document aimed at enhancing the material interest of those involved in gathering, storing, and processing the harvest. The essence of this decision is simple: Those working people who overfulfill the plan (not counting produce which wittingly will not reach the consumer) will receive special chits entitling them to acquire goods in increased demand.

[Olbig] Boris Nikolayevich, let us return to your description of the work of the Russian Supreme Soviet. How is it possible to find a consensus with both "right-wingers" and "left-wingers"?

[Yeltsin] At the congress we registered literally all the deputies' groups, and they are equal before parliament. Incidentally, the USSR Supreme Soviet has not yet registered the interregional deputies' group... Almost every evening after the sessions I was sure to meet with some group. As a rule, the discussion was frank and without snubs—which obviously drew us closer. Such conversations lasting two or three hours result in 80 percent of deputies who previously disagreed with me sharing my views. And they all see that I do not sit with arms folded but work 20 hours a day, i.e. I can work even when not in opposition.

[Olbig] Are you not a little disappointed that your traditional opponent—Yegor Ligachev—has left the political arena?

[Yeltsin] In my opinion, time has acted as an arbiter between us. This "loyal Leninist" has lagged even further behind life than the party which he glorifies. He simply became unnecessary to it, and it sent him into retirement. Not that there is any need to judge him severely—time itself has put everything in its proper place...

[Olbig] Will Russia have its own KGB, and is the disgraced Kalugin not aspiring to the role of chairman? Have you had a discussion with him?

[Yeltsin] I did not speak of this with him. There has already been a discussion of several candidacies, but only one is known at present. USSR People's Deputy Major Lopatin, who is not unknown in the country, will most likely be appointed deputy chairman of the new Public Security Committee. The committee will have totally different functions from the KGB. Its chief function will be to defend the person's interests and his civic rights. It will not be a "denunciatory" organ but a protective one. KGB subunits on Russian territory will be subordinate to the Russian Supreme Soviet alone through the Russian Public Security Committee.

In just the same way the bank has been removed from subordination to the Council of Ministers. This is unusual for our country. It too will not be subordinate to the Council of Ministers, so that the latter is not tempted to print money not backed by goods. The bank's functions will include control over money bills. Our own Ministry of Finance has also come into being, and its minister is just 32 years old. In general, the average age of members of the Russian Council of Ministers is 47.

[Olbig] In any revolutionary situation the working class always has the final word. It was stated at the first miners congress that the CPSU is hindering transformations more than promoting them today. What is your relationship with the miners and with the working class in general?

[Yeltsin] I have already had meetings with the miners of Vorkuta, the Kuzbass, and Donetsk. And we found a common language. On 11 July they were preparing to hold a political strike, and some people in the Union government were reckoning that I would dissuade them. I did not do so. For the miners the strike was an important act in the struggle for their rights. They thereby expressed their lack of confidence in the Union government for ignoring the miners' demands. USSR Council of Ministers resolution 608 has been virtually wrecked—it has not been fulfilled on almost all counts. The only thing I asked them was not to prolong the strike and so avoid destabilization in the country. Then I addressed the miners on television. And they did what they had promised: They held rallies and marches, which only took a few hours. The Russian government, not relying on the center, is doing everything possible to ease the miners' lot.

In their resolution the miners expressed confidence in the Russian government—which attests to a mutual understanding so essential for all sides.

[Olbig] Boris Nikolayevich, in what circumstances might you resign?

[Yeltsin] If the people deny me their trust and if we fail to fulfill the program within three years. For me this is the last milestone in my life. But I am an optimist.

Kaliningrad To Disband Rayon Committees

LD0908133190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] A united plenum held in Kaliningrad has taken the decision to keep the CPSU city committee and to disband the rayon committees. Comrade (Yusov), first secretary of the Kaliningrad party city committee stated that the main arguments in favor of disbanding the rayon committees were the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress which gave greater independence and not a few rights to the primary organizations. If this is the case, why do they need the previous guardianships of the rayon committees? Having handed over some functions to local soviets, the city committee should henceforth

become a purely political body, a kind of center whose duty is to develop a program for the city's social and economic development common to all party organizations, and to implement it in the soviets through communist deputies. It will be its job to elaborate the strategy and tactics of the city party organization.

Western Republics

Ukraine CP Protests Dismantling of Lenin Statues

LD1008012990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2020 GMT 9 Aug 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Summary] "The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine has protested strongly against the dismantling of Lenin monuments in the Ukrainian towns of Chervonograd and Ternopol on the decision of a session of the local soviets of people's deputies. It is a very tough document. Act of outrage, desecration, and insolent provocation are not the strongest of the expressions it contains. The process of dismantling monuments has spread from East Europe to us."

"Night news recently showed reportage from Chervonograd. Here is one from Ternopol, where a statue of Lenin has just been demolished."

[Unidentified correspondent] The decision was made on 18 July. Since last Monday a marathon meeting has been in progress at the site of the monument, with anti-Lenin placards. The oblast procurator has protested to the city soviet of people's deputies that its action violates a USSR law on protection and use of historical and cultural monuments. But the protest was not examined. The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet had a heated discussion of the affair, but made no decision.

Donetsk Miners Oust Party Committee

LD1008031790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2020 GMT on 9 August in the "Television News Service Program" carries a three-minute video report from Trudovskaya mine in Donetsk by an unidentified correspondent.

The correspondent reports that a miners' referendum was held there on 9 August and decided by a majority to oust the party committee from the territory of the enterprise. According to the correspondent, it was felt that "the mines are not the place for the expression of political disagreements under a multiparty system."

The correspondent reports that more than 2,000 people have recently resigned from the party in Donetsk. Many miners have withheld all or part of their membership subscriptions, and "the political enlightenment rooms are empty," he states.

The correspondent concludes his report with a brief interview with a miner who says that the party committee and All-Union Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] do not deserve confidence and are not respected.

Belorussia's Dementey Interviewed on Sovereignty
90UN2543B Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 12 Jul 90 p 3

[Interview with N.I. Dementey, Belorussian SSR people's deputy and chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet, by unidentified BELTA correspondent; place and date of interview not given: "The Sovereignty of the Republic: Genuine Rather Than Declaratory"]

[Text] A memorandum on the state sovereignty of the republic by People's Deputy N.I. Dementey, chairman of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, was recently published in republic newspapers. This document was disseminated as official at a session of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet. New, unconventional approaches in it caused tremendous interest. In conjunction with numerous questions, a BELTA correspondent interviewed N.I. Dementey.

[BELTA] Nikolay Ivanovich, in your memorandum you raised many issues of ensuring the sovereignty of the republic in a manner which is new in principle. What is the reason for this radical approach?

[Dementey] The point is that the significance of the notion of sovereignty has somehow faded in our country at the level of common consciousness. At present, quite a few people do not have any idea of what it really means. Actually, sovereignty means nothing other than the supremacy of the republic, its independence in resolving the main issues of internal and external activities in the spheres of state, economic, and sociocultural development. We cannot do without radical measures in order to ensure the implementation of these categories in real life, proceeding from the current situation in the republic. Still, I would prefer not to use the words "radical measures." We need a comprehensive, balanced, scientific approach to this problem.

[BELTA] In perusing your memorandum I found that some provisions on sovereignty are present in the Belorussian SSR Constitution currently in effect. Is their transfer from the Constitution to the declaration a repeat of what has been done to some degree? Actually, what is the point?

[Dementey] This is not a simple issue. There are a number of provisions in the Constitution in the absence of which sovereignty is out of the question, be it the sovereignty of the Belorussian SSR or that of another state. Therefore, we cannot do without a reference to these constitutional provisions in adopting a declaration on the sovereignty of the Belorussian SSR. However, the sum total of such norms in the Constitution currently in effect is not sufficient for ensuring the position of the

Belorussian Republic as a truly sovereign state. Therefore, the scope of such guarantees should be substantially expanded, which is what was done in the document you mentioned. This is point one.

Secondly—this is the main point—it is necessary to ensure not just the sovereignty of the Belorussian SSR. After all, it is formally proclaimed at the constitutional level. As we now know, in conventional terms there are formal and actual constitutions. In keeping with previously existing stereotypes, they impressed on us (in different ways and quite effectively) that constitutions of the first type, formal ones, are characteristic of bourgeois societies only. However, life puts everything in its proper place. By now, we see that the attribute "formal" may very well be applied to our constitutional creation of law.

While not denying the fact that many provisions codified in the USSR Constitution and the Belorussian SSR Constitution are quite progressive, we cannot but acknowledge the declarative nature of the provisions which have no real content and are not "operable." What I have said applies fully not only to, for example, ensuring a number of human rights and other most significant aspects of the life of society, but also the sovereignty of the Belorussian SSR. Consequently, ensuring real rather than declaratory independence of the republic and ensuring its primacy in solving the main issues of internal and external activities are mainly emphasized in my statement to the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet.

I am not going to enumerate examples in order to show the virtually complete absence of such independence. The scope of these examples would embrace virtually all of the most significant aspects of life of the Belorussian people. In literature, in periodicals, in the everyday communication of the people virtually nobody ever says "the Belorussian state," despite official recognition of the Union republics as sovereign socialist states by the USSR Constitution. Everybody says "the Belorussian republic." It appears to be the same, but it is not quite. At present, the expression "the Belorussian republic" is not associated for our popular masses with the expression "the Belorussian state." This is a small nuance, but it is telling.

I believe that giving Belorussian national statehood real rather than formal significance is our primary task.

[BELTA] Yes, but why do you think that this is exactly the priority task of the Supreme Soviet? Some people believe that, the importance of the problem in question notwithstanding, there are more significant problems, for example overcoming stagnation phenomena in the economy.

[Dementey] Definitely, this is a very significant issue which bears no procrastination. It would also appear that the issue should be raised in this manner from the point of view of our classical canons which say that the economy is the basis that determines the character and nature of relations in the superstructure: Let us first take

care of the economy, and then we will resolve other issues—state independence, the development of culture, and so on. However, this is a simplified approach. Let us not forget that this interpretation of the basis and the superstructure is very one-sided, and very conventional as well.

I believe that we should proceed from the opposite influence of the superstructure on the basis, including the influence of such an element of the superstructure as the state. Besides, is it possible to deny that holding state power in its entirety makes it possible to direct the development of the relations of production onto a path different from that followed to date?

What is topical for us at present in the economic sphere? I will not be mistaken if I say that it is to create conditions for ensuring the genuine economic independence of the producer by deeds rather than words, to defend the interests of the consumer in every way possible, to eliminate all types of monopolism, to develop healthy entrepreneurship on a broad scale, and so on. It is obvious that these issues can only be resolved if one has genuine sovereignty. For now, Belorussia does not have it, and we cannot solve the problems enumerated at a qualitatively new level.

Here is evidence. Without exaggeration our republic holds a respectable place in many indicators of economic development in both industry and agriculture, in whose sphere of management I previously worked. However, given our current level of independence all efforts by the republic may be brought to naught by several unfortunate and irresponsible decisions of the so-called center, no matter how much the Belorussian people increase the volume of production and ensure reductions in its cost.

Let us look at recent years. Many specific decisions have been unfortunate, whereas the overall concept of making a transition to a market economy while ensuring a proper level of social protection for the populace has been correct. This includes the cancellation of wage and price increment controls, while all other elements of the new economic mechanism have not been actually developed, and have even been hampered. All of this has been an unfavorable influence on the production of goods and foodstuffs.

The role of the state, which it is called upon to play in the environment of genuine goods-and-money, economically accountable relations in the economy, was not ensured, namely, strict oversight of compliance with consumer specifications for the quality of goods, the adjustment of production volumes by economic rather than administrative methods, particularly by establishing preferential profits, taxes, interest rates on credit, and so on. Complicated and unconventional as the problem of a market transition may be, it is clear that what has been done in our country with the emission of currency resources not backed up by goods cannot be done in the absence of a clear-cut plan or the determination to see it through.

Understandably the consumption fund may only be increased to the degree to which an increment of the national income is secured, as long as the structure of capital investment is not revised. It is naive to believe that the standard of living of the populace may be improved only by printing additional bills.

Now tell me whether we may hope that in the future the policy of the center in the economic sphere will become exceptionally rational. Thus far, there have been no such guarantees.

The latest measures for a transition to a regulated market planned by the government cause one to doubt its ability to accomplish this in a sufficiently optimal manner. A sharp price increase and a simultaneous decline in the standard of living, which is not ruled out, are unacceptable for the very simple reason that there are quite a few ways to avoid such antipeople measures. This is the case with all other issues: further augmenting the scientific potential, and developing the agrarian, industrial, and construction sectors, the social sphere, and culture. They cannot be resolved directly within the republic without real sovereignty.

[BELTA] Nikolay Ivanovich, a statement in the periodicals said that the need to adopt the Declaration on the Sovereignty of the Belorussian SSR was acknowledged by a majority in the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet after instructions were received from "above," and that, supposedly, "a group of deputies of the Democratic Bloc" had proposed placing the issue of sovereignty on the agenda of the republic Supreme Soviet earlier. What can you say concerning this?

[Dementey] Indeed, this was mentioned in the initial days of the session's proceedings. I also discussed sovereignty in my speech before being elected to the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Moreover, I was concerned about this problem even before, in my old job. However, as a politician I was only able to raise this issue officially, that is, submit pertinent documents for consideration by the supreme echelon of the republic, i.e., the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet, only when the course of political reform confirmed that this was a realistic, practicable step rather than an idea for its own sake.

[BELTA] Based on what facts did you come to the conclusion on the timeliness of submitting your memorandum which, perhaps, has a claim to becoming the basis for this declaration?

[Dementey] In the environment of perestroika, such facts kept accumulating. For example, on 26 April 1990 the USSR Law on the Delineation of Powers of the USSR and the Subjects of the Federation was adopted at the Union level. I am not going to describe the law, but I will say straightforwardly that it does little to ensure the true independence of Union republics, and that the spirit of recognizing the real sovereignty of the republics does not permeate it. This is the case to an even greater degree with the previously adopted USSR Laws "On General

Principles of Local Self-Government and the Local Economy in the USSR" and "On the Foundations of Economic Relations of the USSR, Union, and Autonomous Republics." But it is based on these laws that our relations with the center must be arranged.

Look at the issue of economic reform and switching to a market economy. After all, it was, in essence, transferred for consideration to the Union republics only after it failed in the Supreme Soviet of the country, though the latter did formally adopt the draft submitted by the USSR government. However, a reform that radical should have been initiated by its discussion locally, directly in the republics, and only later resolved at the Union level.

There are other issues as well, for example the preparation of the draft new USSR Constitution. It is clear that this is the most important document which predetermines the main aspects of our life for many decades to come, including in the area of national-state arrangements. However, do many legal scientists from the Union republics take part in developing this and many other laws of the USSR, including those concerning the republics? Just a handful, and then on rare occasions.

There are also other examples of the continuing condescending approach to the republics on the part of the representatives of the center—not Russia, not the Russian people, who themselves feel all the consequences of this policy, but exactly the representatives of the center who fail to grasp the reality that it is exactly the Union republics that give the USSR the relevant rights rather than vice versa.

Therefore, having weighed everything, I came to the conclusion that, in the absence of radical steps on the part of the republics aimed at ensuring their sovereignty, the center will continue to treat the republics administratively, and often in a blatant manner. This is why I made my statement to the Supreme Soviet, believing that other options have been exhausted.

[BELTA] Nikolay Ivanovich, your memorandum refers to state sovereignty. However, there is also the sovereignty of the people, national sovereignty. What is the relationship between the notions of state sovereignty and the sovereignty of the people? Will the latter be ensured if the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of the Belorussian SSR is adopted?

[Dementey] Definitely, the declaration should say precisely that the Belorussian state recognizes, respects, and, moreover, proceeds from the sovereignty of the Belorussian people. The bitter lessons of our former statehood require that such measures be taken. In general, the time has come to give up the one-sided interpretation of the state as a coercive apparatus, a special stick, a suppression machine, and so on. In civilized, highly developed, rule-of-law societies the state is something different, something that ensures the interests of all citizens. It is an instrument of their social protection.

[BELTA] Nikolay Ivanovich, as I understood it your concept of state sovereignty, while elevating to a high level the issues of ensuring the independence of the Belorussian republic, at the same does not rule out its belonging to the USSR, though on terms which are new in principle.

[Dementey] Indeed, this is so. I hope that we will be able to create a union of our republics within which they will truly have equal rights and be sovereign. This is to say nothing about the voluntary basis for belonging to the union. The creation of a new union should begin with exactly the voluntary basis. A procedure for determining this voluntary basis should be worked out by the republic itself.

[BELTA] Are there problems as far as the equality of legal and actual rights of the Union republics is concerned?

[Dementey] Yes, unfortunately, and recently these problems have exacerbated. Let us look, for example, at the supreme organ of state power in the country. By now the Congress of People's Deputies has become such an organ, whose composition reflects the population strength of republics, in which the republics with the largest populations dominate. I believe that we need a supreme organ of state power of the future union of sovereign states whose organizational form will be absolutely new; in this organ the republics would be granted legally equal opportunities to resolve matters assigned to the jurisdiction of the union. In my opinion, the new union may not come about in the absence of this.

[BELTA] What about the actual equal rights of the republics?

[Dementey] This issue is perhaps even more complex. After all, an extremely unfavorable situation has now developed due to all kinds of factors: the subjective and arbitrary approach to the location of productive forces, the setting of prices for products manufactured (shipped out) and consumed (shipped in), the determination of sources and rates of contributions to the budgets, natural-geographic, and some other conditions. Some regions and republics are substantially, frequently by factor of two, ahead of or behind other regions and republics in terms of the relevant indicators of economic, social, and cultural development.

[BELTA] Perhaps, on the way to forming a new union of sovereign states the following issue needs to be resolved: What powers are to be transferred to the Union and what are to be left to the republics?

[Dementey] Moving on to the practical aspect of the question of the future Union treaty—this will be one of its focal points. First of all, we should not be guided by the notorious principle of democratic centralism. This principle interpreted literally, as it is codified in Article 3 of the current USSR Constitution, promises nothing good not only to the republics but to any administrative-territorial units. I approach this principle only from the

point of view of organizing management, that is, the distribution of jurisdictions, including that between the USSR and the republics.

So, the principle of democratic centralism in the context in which it is codified in the Constitution states that the decisions of superior organs are binding on the lower-echelon organs. This is what its essence is, despite there being a qualification concerning the combination of unified management (unified once again!) with local initiative and creative activities. Does centralism in general, without the democratic qualification, take into account local peculiarities? It does, because it cannot be used by any system otherwise. I think that in distributing jurisdictions between the USSR and the Union republics we should not proceed from centralism, even if it is democratic. It is necessary to make the principle of the optimal correlation of centralization and decentralization the foundation for the division of functions and powers. This means that resolving all issues which may be decentralized with no harm done to the endeavor should be immediately decentralized, i.e. transferred to the jurisdiction of the republics from the jurisdiction of the Union.

At present, the concentration of a tremendous mass of issues, and not necessarily the main ones, at the level of the USSR is primarily characteristic of the aspect of the situation in question. A lot has been said and written about this. Nonetheless, I cannot fail to say with a bitter feeling that until now the republic, as represented by its supreme organs of state power and government, has been actually able to solve only a quite limited scope of issues, especially those associated with resources, finances, and so on.

Meanwhile, one of the main rules of any scientifically organized management says: Only issues that cannot be resolved locally in an adequately efficient manner should be referred to the upper echelon. This rule has been virtually inoperative in our case.

The USSR is not a unitary state but rather a federative state, according to the Constitution. Consequently, the republics as the subjects of the federation, and sovereign republics at that, should have a greater scope of powers than the component parts of a unitary state. Their right to manage state, economic, and sociocultural development in the new union of sovereign states should be quite extensive and, of course, genuine.

[BELTA] Well, what specific issues may actually be transferred to the Union?

[Dementey] I think that their scope should be substantially reduced. The economic, cadre, and other potential of the Union republics at present is such that they may resolve all the main issues of their economic, technical, scientific, cultural, social, and other development. This is why I would consider possible a transfer of the issues of the defense of our country directly to the jurisdiction of the USSR. As far as the issues of internal security are concerned, the republics themselves should resolve them

in all forms. For example, we are resolutely against the use of servicemen drafted in Belorussia for a military solution to problems in other republics. The Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet has already made a declaration on this, and, perhaps, the time is coming for our government to take practical steps for its implementation.

Incidentally, I think that the transfer of defense issues to the jurisdiction of the USSR does not rule out the existence of their own military units in the republics, all the more so because there is a historic precedent of this kind in our country. However, distributing the bulk of the USSR Armed Forces among ethnic compartments is not justified in any case. In general, leaving the framework of a unified defense system is undesirable in yet another aspect, in particular from the point of view of ensuring the stability of the borders of our republic.

As far as other issues are concerned, for example rail and air transportation, as well as the accomplishment of major programs of an economic, scientific-technical, and social nature, they should be thoroughly studied. In this matter, specialists in the pertinent areas of science should have a say, including specialists in the organization of management, national relations, and so on. However, in any case the scope of issues transferred by the republics to the Union should be first, restricted, and second, exhaustive.

[BELTA] Could you tell me what your attitude is toward the concept of so-called joint jurisdiction of the Union and the republics? Was this concept as implemented in practice one of the means of actually usurping the rights of Union republics?

[Dementey] Indeed, this is the way it was. The industries and national economic facilities of direct all-Union significance, that is those legally and actually removed from the jurisdiction of the republics, were not really numerous. At the same time, an overwhelming majority of such industries and facilities are under the so-called joint jurisdiction of the Union and the republics even now. However, the very essence of this form of distributing jurisdiction consisted of concentrating the main, key issues—planning, finance, material-technical supplies, and so on—in the jurisdiction of the USSR organs. Meanwhile, the organs of the Union republics, in particular, Union-republic ministries, departments, and organizations, were parts of the unified system of the Union-republic organs of the USSR and could influence them only to a very insignificant degree. Therefore, I am against joint jurisdiction of the Union and the republics. It needs to be resolved firmly which issues the republic transfers to the jurisdiction of the Union and which it resolves on its own.

[BELTA] What is your attitude toward the powers the USSR organs have at present to adopt the foundations of laws of the USSR and the Union republics on a quite extensive scope of issues?

[Dementey] It is expedient to codify the right of the Union to make such laws on certain issues in the new

Union treaty. However, once again the scope of these issues should be reduced many times. Look, for example, at the pertinent articles of the Belorussian SSR Constitution which state that the Belorussian SSR manages land use, the housing stock and communal facilities, education, health care, culture, and so on. It would appear that the solution is correct. What is the actual situation? First, the pertinent foundations of legislation are adopted in the USSR echelon. These legislative acts contain the main benchmarks for resolving the pertinent issues in the republics, which the latter cannot transgress. Second, with regard to a number of the problems enumerated above which the constitutions of the republics place in their direct jurisdiction, USSR organs are created for managing these sectors, which also unjustifiably restricts the actual potential of the republics.

In general, the tendency to dictate to the republics how they ought to live is clearly seen in almost everything at the USSR echelon. Unfortunately, this is still the case. In the process much of it is detrimental to direct contacts between the republics.

[BELTA] How are we to get away from this? How and in what forms are we to establish direct economic relations between the republics?

[Dementey] I believe that from the legal point of view this means first of all contracts between them and the subjects of economic operations. Appropriate measures aimed at maintaining or changing the condition of the economy in individual republics will, perhaps, be carried out by the Union and from its budget as well to some degree. Incidentally, the economic independence of the republics also presupposes their right to ban shipping specific products from their territories if it is detrimental to the interests of a republic, especially vital interests. This is a usual practice in commercial relations between states. A state, and therefore a Union republic, may exercise such a limited right of control over property in some cases. It is another matter that it is necessary to implement measures of this kind primarily by economic methods—setting appropriate tariffs, dues, and so on.

[BELTA] In your concept of the sovereignty of the Belorussian SSR there are theses which appear attractive: that all facilities of the national economic complex located on the territory of the republic are the property of its people, that the republic owns all of its resources, and that nobody has the right to dispose of the territory of the republic for any purpose without a show of the will of its people. Putting it mildly, are your claims not excessive?

[Dementey] I believe that they are not. Let us say that the talk currently heard at the USSR echelon to the effect that there is all-Union property, that is, property which does not belong to the republics, on the territories of the Union republics, is not well-grounded for quite a number of reasons. First, if the construction of a particular facility was financed from the Union budget, it does not mean that the facility does not belong to the republic.

After all, the Union budget consists of the contributions of specific Union republics. At present, it is impossible to establish which republic has contributed to creating the national economic complex of the country and how much, taking into account the imperfection of prices in effect for the products manufactured and supplied, the arbitrary establishment of the sources and rates of contributions to the state budgets of all levels, and considerable subjectivity in resolving the issues of locating the facilities of the national economy.

Let us put it this way: All republics have contributed to creating this complex and, consequently, to creating the economies of all republics. In their turn, all have done their part to develop the economy of a particular, specific republic. This is why at present the most rational way is to proceed from the thesis that all facilities of the national economy situated on the territory of a republic, with the exception of the property of foreign citizens and companies, are the property of the republic, i.e., the property of its people or individual citizens. There is no all-Union property in general, without the presence in it of a part of republic property.

Besides, it should be taken into account that when decisions were made on designating particular facilities as those of all-Union significance, this was done without the consent of the republics. Actually, nobody asked them.

I believe that the issue is quite clear with regard to land, water, forest, and other resources found on the territory of a republic—only its people have the right to resolve issues of their use. Moreover, thought should be given to an opportunity to respond to events which pose a real threat to the vital interests of the people and may be viewed as directly interfering with their future, though they do not occur on the territory of the republic.

I mean the Chernobyl catastrophe. It did not happen on the territory of our republic, but the consequences of this terrible catastrophe affect mainly Belorussia. In general, we should think about a real mechanism of preventive protection against the eventual consequences of this nature. This is not a simple issue, but it is clear that it is easier to prevent trouble than to eliminate its consequences.

[BELTA] What is your attitude toward the right of the Union republics to secede from the USSR?

[Dementey] As a right, it is very favorable. Also, I believe that the republic itself rather than the Union should set forth conditions and a mechanism for its secession from the composition of the USSR; this follows from its sovereignty. To be sure, the republic should set forth these conditions before joining the Union; after all, they may be such that other members of the federation will not agree to them. I think that the creation of a new union of sovereign states and the signing of a new Union treaty are possible only on the basis of a consensus of all subjects of the federation on all provisions of this treaty which are significant in principle.

[BELTA] Nikolay Ivanovich, I will finally allow myself a joke, without referring specifically to the deputy who said the following: "If Nikolay Ivanovich has such radical ideas about the state sovereignty of the Belorussian Republic, why is he still not a member of the Belorussian People's Front?"

[Dementey] Well, I do not see this as joke material at all. Indeed, Belorussian People's Front representatives have stated a number of radical proposals of a progressive nature in this matter. As the chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet, I think that such proposals made by them should be taken into account (incidentally, I do not want any delimitation). I am ready for constructive cooperation with all healthy democratic forces, especially if this cooperation is expressed in specific deeds benefiting our people.

Furthermore, I would like to bring to your attention the fact that many other deputies of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet have also voiced progressive ideas and proposals. Our common duty is to take note and support them. In general, I believe that the position which a particular deputy takes on all specific issues is of primary significance rather than the group he is affiliated with.

We acutely need a consensus on a truly humane platform, to which man with his varied needs and an opportunity to express himself in all kinds of spheres of life will be central. The constructive cooperation of all democratic forces of the republic in implementing such a platform regardless of the sociopolitical movement they belong to and of the social or professional stratum they represent is one of the significant conditions for the Belorussian people to make social progress and prosper.

[BELTA] Here is the final question, Nikolay Ivanovich. Let us assume that the session of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet adopts the Declaration on the Sovereignty of the Republic—I have almost no doubt about it. However, the well-being of our people will not improve abruptly due to this. After all, what does independence accomplish exactly from the point of view of the people's material standard of living?

[Dementey] Yes, you are absolutely right. The declaration is a political document. Naturally, the situation in our consumer market will not improve right away due to its adoption. However, we still cannot lose sight of the main point. By acquiring real independence, we open the way to improving the efficiency of work because we acquire the true status of master of our land. We perceive that we will have to answer ourselves for some dereliction rather than point fingers at the center, which some of our cadres in all echelons of management are very good at doing. Finally, we should understand that only our own work, only initiative and enterprise in all sectors of work, only the highest degree of responsibility of all will make it possible for us to better our lives.

Caucasus

Armenian President on National Forces, Karabakh

AU0908125290 Vienna Television Service in German
2000 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Interview with Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan, by Raimund Loew; place and date of interview not given—recorded; statements by Ter-Petrosyan in Russian with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [Announcer] Today the ultimatum of the central Soviet Government concerning the dissolution of nationalist militia should have expired. In the case of Armenia, Moscow has now agreed to a compromise in negotiations with Levon Ter-Petrosyan, who was surprisingly elected president of the Republic of Armenia last Saturday. The Armenian nationalist was in prison between December 1988 and the summer of 1989 because of his political commitment.

[Loew] In Armenia the Communist Party has lost its power. As a former political prisoner you are now at the head of the republic. Does this strain your relationship with the Kremlin?

[Ter-Petrosyan] I am not the first political prisoner to assume such a function. The first one was Vaclav Havel. As far as I am concerned I think that one must forget what one had to suffer before, if what is now at stake are relations between states and politics.

[Loew] Did the Soviet Government apologize to you?

[Ter-Petrosyan] There has not been a proper apology, but the interior minister has admitted that mistakes were made.

[Loew] President Gorbachev has called for the dissolution of the Armenian military units. How do you wish to overcome this crisis?

[Ter-Petrosyan] My talks in Moscow have been successful. I talked with Premier Ryzhkov, the interior minister, and the KGB head. They are now prepared to concede us more time. We will solve this problem with our own means, without interference by the Army or the Interior Ministry.

[Loew] How do you want to disarm the informal Armenian fighters?

[Ter-Petrosyan] Our plan is to integrate the healthy forces into the Armenian police. As far as the criminal elements are concerned, the real bandits, who we also have, we will simply have to struggle against them.

[Loew] Do you want Armenia to become independent and declare itself an independent state like Lithuania?

[Ter-Petrosyan] Yes, we aspire to independence, but not in the style of Lithuania. The Lithuanians are a special

case. We are preparing an Armenian independence declaration. However, we know that this cannot be achieved overnight. This is a long process.

[Loew] What about the problem in Karabakh? Does the fact that you were elected president not threaten to exacerbate the crisis?

[Ter-Petrosyan] No, not at all. I am optimistic that we will soon establish direct negotiations with Azerbaijan and that detente will become possible.

Karabakh Committee Member Views NKAO Tension
90US1187A Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
10 Jul 90 p 2

[Interview with Armenian SSR People's Deputy Babken Ararktsyan, board member of the Armenian Pannational Movement and "Karabakh" Committee member, by ARMENPRESS correspondent S. Akopyan; place and date of interview not given: "Extinguish the Fire Using Political Means"—first two paragraphs are an editorial introduction]

[Text] The situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast has deteriorated sharply in recent days as a result of events which are well known. In spite of a rigid information blockade, alarming reports arrive daily in Armenia concerning the most recent instances of illegal actions and events. Neither does the situation in the republic give any reason for calm.

Our ARMENPRESS correspondent met with Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] People's Deputy Babken Ararktsyan, board member of the Armenian Pannational Movement and "Karabakh" Committee member, and asked him to share his ideas on certain issues which today trouble all of us.

[Akopyan] Babken, what do you have to say about the recent events which have created extreme tension in Artsakh, and what in your opinion must we do in this regard?

[Ararktsyan] Here we must address not only the most recent events fresh in our minds. These are just the result of a whole string of events in a new approach to resolving the Karabakh question. And this approach consists of the following: Do everything with the use of troops.

Since January of this year, following the events in Baku, troops took power into their hands in Karabakh, assuming political and executive, even social and economic functions. In other words, what the Azerbaijan leadership was unable to do because of the resistance of the Artsakh population, what the Volskiy committee could not manage, is now "successfully" being carried out by troops.

It is no accident that high-ranking representatives of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], KGB Internal Troops Command, and the Procuracy have become regular visitors recently, traveling from the center to

Armenia and Artsakh. But one thing is clear—it is not these people who must solve the problems.

This complex situation is artificially created by political forces which, striving to get out of the water dry, have succeeded with great mastery in shifting responsibility to the troops and arousing antimilitary sentiment, the danger of which is evident.

Meanwhile it is clear that whatever is said about the armed detachments (there are disturbances, of course—we see that), it is all derived from the situation in Karabakh, and people in Armenia and Artsakh will be calm only in the event a political solution is reached to the Karabakh question.

First of all, the legal authority which was eliminated by illegal, unconstitutional means must be restored—the oblast soviet (and, as we see after the Gadrud events—the rayon soviets as well).

This is the first task—and we must struggle in its name both in Armenia and Artsakh. The newly elected Armenian Supreme Soviet is called upon to play a great role here. We must demand that the Constitution be observed in Artsakh, regardless of the deficiencies and contradictions present there. Artsakh must have its own constitutional authority.

Secondly, although over these two and a half years we have become accustomed to getting no response to our political judgments, appeals, and protests, these are nonetheless definite political acts. Their effect seems insignificant, unseen; yet in the final analysis they cannot help but have an influence. It is reassuring that the Armenian authority has resorted to such steps in recent times. Evidence of this is seen in the political assessment of the Gadrud events given by the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers. It is impossible to ignore this form of struggle.

Of course, we might also address economic measures, which are receiving a very great deal of attention today. But all of this is nonetheless simply derived. Economic measures never move ahead of political decisions—only parallel to them, and trailing half a step behind. Currently there are many organizations, each of which is providing certain economic assistance to Artsakh without mutual cooperation, without a long-range program. I am in no way denying their significance, but a state approach is necessary in developing the Artsakh economy.

[Akopyan] Do you think that, while our parliament is being convened, self-government in Artsakh might be entirely eliminated?

[Ararktsyan] It's a reasonable question, but I don't think so. Today it is not even clear when the parliament will begin to function, and during the initial period, I would say, it will have to resolve numerous organizational

matters (the agenda, regulations, etc.). We should therefore be thinking about what must be done right now. I believe it is entirely unnecessary to wait for the parliament to begin its work. Additionally, when it does begin to work it must have some kind of basis—materials and documents—on which to structure its activity. The currently functioning presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet can establish a commission from the newly elected deputies, people's deputies of Artsakh, which could carry out a certain joint effort, i.e., establish a material base for the work of the Supreme Soviet, which would use this to make decisions, up to demanding that an extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies be convened.

[Akopyan] What are the Armenian Pannational Movement and "Karabakh" Committee doing in this regard?

[Ararktsyan] Together with our comrades working in Artsakh, of course, we are striving to do something. We have prepared numerous materials and delivered them to democratic movements and organizations of the Soviet Union and foreign countries. Recently a group of legal experts, specialists in human rights from the United States, came to Armenia. We presented the Artsakh problem to them from the human rights point of view, covering its 70-year history right up to recent days and the Gadrud events. Our representatives have recently been in the Baltic republics, Moscow, and Leningrad, have set up radio and television broadcasts in the localities, and dispatched press materials and video tapes.

I believe that USSR people's deputies from Armenia, and especially from Artsakh, should play a great role in this matter. It is incomprehensible today—when tension in Artsakh has reached this extremely high point, when lawlessness has become so great in scope, when, apparently, the only influence on troops is that which can be exerted by people's deputies—that deputies are physically not even present there. Nothing is preventing Armenian people's deputies from being there and tracking the situation, uncovering the lawlessness and arbitrariness of the military, and presenting an objective picture in the Supreme Soviet of the country or the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

Unfortunately, there is no one in Artsakh today who might be able to take responsibility.

[Akopyan] Today the government of Azerbaijan is unilaterally creating a line of demarcation between Armenia and Azerbaijan. And the mass media are attempting to present this act as a panacea to prevent all ills. What would you say about this?

[Ararktsyan] Yes, the propaganda apparatus is trying to present this as a very sound decision, whose aim is to avert conflict on the border. It would seem to be a noble idea. But it is unacceptable since it means isolating Artsakh, which will then be subject to a blockade—not just economically, but militarily as well. It will be completely denied the opportunity for any kind of intervention on the part of Armenia.

The line of demarcation would make sense only in the event normal conditions are established for communications with Artsakh. In the meantime, not only are there no prospects for opening up the Goris-Lachin-Stepanakert road, but air communications too have become increasingly difficult with every day.

[Akopyan] The main topic of our discussion today has been the problem of Artsakh. But let me ask you to briefly characterize the situation in the republic as well.

[Ararktsyan] The political atmosphere in Armenia today is intense—it might be termed the calm before the storm. Many calls and appeals are being sounded by the organs of authority and social organizations which have the aim of lessening tension. But the processes taking place are objective in nature; appeals will not help. Everyone understands—many consciously, others subconsciously—that the source of the tension is Artsakh. If the fire there is not extinguished using political means, even if all the detachments are disarmed or through some kind of miracle they disarm themselves voluntarily, tomorrow without fail new ones will begin to be created insofar as this is dictated by the situation in Artsakh.

Political leaders in Moscow must understand that whatever labels they hang, whatever declarations they make concerning "Armenian terrorism," it will have no effect on our people. On the contrary, it may lead to a new escalation in the tension. Such a trend is being observed, by the way—to direct the struggle into the stream of terrorism.

This was shown quite convincingly in the "preparations" of 27 May. Up until now we thought that the announcements of "disturbances expected in Armenia" were being heard only on "Mayak" and the "Vremya" program. Now, however, we have obtained foreign newspapers, including some of a democratic orientation, which published this information provided by TASS on the eve of 27 May. With enviable efficiency—which under other circumstances is lacking, as a rule—public opinion was set up. There cannot be any divergence of opinion as to the fact that 27 May was prepared. The chain of coincidence and chance, about which much has been said and written, confirms that in order to "rectify" the political situation in Armenia, the authorities will stop at nothing. Outwardly the impression is being created of a desire to move to dialogue with democratic forces and social organizations, while in fact a savage struggle is being waged to preserve their positions. Conducting talks with them, especially with representatives of punitive organs, no longer makes any sense.

[Akopyan] And what do you intend to use in confronting the situation which has developed?

[Ararktsyan] One thing only—the Armenian parliament, expressing the interests of the Armenian people.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Continues Deliberations

'Vremya' Report Discussed

NC0908100190 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
0600 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] The first session of the 12th convocation of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet is continuing its deliberations today. Mavr Danielyan reports from the meeting hall of the Supreme Soviet that despite the discussions of the last two days, the draft declaration on the republic's political status has not yet been finalized.

Today's session will discuss the list of the standing commissions of the Supreme Soviet. The list was endorsed yesterday after the first reading.

Before the start of the Supreme Soviet session today, the deputies held an interesting conversation on the report aired by "Vremya" yesterday evening. Many thought that the attitude of that program has changed somewhat as regards the illumination of the events taking place in Armenia. For the first time, Soviet television viewers were informed that armed formations have been created in Armenia not to attack the neighboring republic and to destroy and pillage its villages, but to defend Armenia's population and borders.

The deputies expressed the view that the end of power vacuum in Armenia probably had an effect on the central authorities' stance toward the Armenian people. The influence of the decisions already passed and those awaiting approval cannot be denied either.

"Vremya" reported the meeting between Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian republic's Supreme Soviet, and Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. It also added that an appeal was made to the USSR president to extend the deadline for the implementation of the decree on the disbandment of the armed formations. Although "Vremya" also showed the frightening array of weapons held by the Armenian formations and claimed they numbered not a mere 40,000 or 140,000 but 160,000, it nevertheless featured General Surkov as saying that the disbandment must be carried out through persuasion, for the Soviet Army was not created to enter into a conflict with its own people.

The fact that the need for a solution of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem through negotiations between the new leadership of Armenia and Azerbaijan was repeated twice on the program did not escape the attention of the deputies.

The republic's Supreme Soviet started its deliberations at 1100.

Independence Debated Further

LD1008051490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2020 GMT 9 Aug 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of Armenia's Supreme Soviet, stated a few days ago that none of Armenia's problems would be resolved unless the social and political situation in the republic could be stabilized. So, this is Yerevan on 9 August:

[Correspondent V. Nazaryan] Today, Yerevan looks outwardly calm, like this, just as it does on an ordinary day, in spite of all expectations. Although on precisely 9 August, the deadline ended that was issued in the decree of the country's president to armed formations for the voluntary surrender of weapons. To all appearances, an accord to extend the ultimatum has been reached. But today, just as in preceding days in the republic's parliament, the debates surrounding the future declaration of Armenia's independence are continuing. Three variants of this document have been submitted for discussion. And in each of them, in spite of the differences that exist, the right of the republic to have its own armed forces, internal services and security subunits which are directly subordinated to the Supreme Soviet has been agreed upon separately. In general, the draft declarations have much in common. The main, controversial question, is the issue of independence. Either Armenia will declare it anew, some people assert, or it will be restored, after being disrupted on 2 December 1920. There are adherents to this version, too. It is difficult to say precisely which variant the deputies prefer. But the entire character of the future declaration depends on that, the discussion of which will, to all appearances, last for a few days yet.

Debate Proposal Postponed

NC1008110990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
1630 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Excerpt] During the morning meeting of the first session of the 12th convocation of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet the deputies made a number of proposals before continuing the debate on the political status of Armenia. For the last two days almost 60 deputies spoke on the this subject. It was pointed out that each of the three versions of the draft declaration on the political status of Armenia must be made known to the public equally. Since KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN in today's [9 August] issue has published the draft declaration prepared by the Armenian Communist Party, it was deemed necessary to publish the other versions of the declaration. It was proposed that following their publication the public should be given the opportunity to learn about the drafts and the deputies should then meet with their constituencies and hear their views, and only then make a final decision. [passage omitted]

Draft Declaration Viewed

NC1008121990 Yerevan International Service
in Armenian 1530 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] Dear compatriots, while Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, was in

Moscow meeting with Nikolay Ryzhkov, members of the Presidential Council, and the leaders of the parliament of the Russian Federation, at yesterday's session the Armenian parliament examined the draft declarations on the political status of the republic. At the deputies' request, the Armenian Communist Party's draft has been published in the press today. This draft version states:

Based on the inalienable right of the Armenian people to self-determination and expressing the unanimous will of the Armenian people, the Armenian Supreme Soviet declares the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic to be a sovereign state within the renewed union structure, created voluntarily, and empowered with the supremacy of state authority, autonomy, full powers, and independence on its entire territory.

The fundamental principles of the declaration note that the Armenian people exercise state authority through the republic's Constitution both directly and through the soviets of people's deputies. This state authority is in force for all of Armenia on the principle of the supremacy of the republic's Constitution and laws.

The Armenian Republic has the right to form its own armed forces, armed units for internal services, and security bodies.

This and the other two versions of the draft declarations were discussed at today's morning session of the Supreme Soviet, and it was decided to continue this work at the commissions level and at the groups set up by the deputies.

The session was informed that the Moscow contacts of Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian parliament, were constructive and useful. Ter-Petrosyan will brief the session about his contacts tomorrow.

Armenian National Army Commander Interviewed *LD0908205190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian* *1800 GMT 9 Aug 90*

[Text] In Armenia, the session of the republic Supreme Soviet continues. Our correspondent (?Karyun) Khomuryan reports from Yerevan:

[Khomuryan] Today's session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet was soon over. The deputies worked together only in the morning and then divided into commissions. In the commissions—of which, by the way, only a few have so far been formed—a lot of work had accumulated because for the whole of these three weeks the session has been working from morning to late evening, and the deputies who have been included in the commissions have had practically no time for serious work there. During today, that gap must be filled.

In the corridors of the session, there has been discussion of information on the meetings and conversations of the Armenian Supreme Soviet chairman with the country's leadership. It must be said that the fact that Levon Ter-Petrosyan went to Moscow at all, and the results of

his work in the capital, are arousing mixed reactions here. I don't mean only among the deputies. At lunchtime, for example, representatives of several home guard formations demonstrated in Lenin Square, where the sessions of the republic's Supreme Soviet are being held, and expressed rather noisily—and I should say aggressively—their negative attitude both to the new Supreme Soviet and to its chairman, who, according to them, is conducting negotiations with Moscow on the fate of the armed formations without prior consultations with them. There are also mixed feelings, in my view, about the new Supreme Soviet among the leadership of the Armenian National Army, as they call themselves. Yesterday I met Vartan Vartanyan, the deputy commander of that army, and a 60-year-old art historian and journalist. Here is a short interview he gave specially for Mayak Radio:

[Begin recording] [Khomuryan] The republic's Supreme Soviet is now working on the adoption of a new concept of Armenia, and before that we heard a statement by the chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet calling on all home guard formations to unite under a common element, under the Supreme Soviet.

[Vartanyan] We have already presented to this Supreme Soviet our declaration specifically stating that these military formations have chosen their headquarters, and that that headquarters will (?emerge into) the Supreme Soviet, the so-called Soviet of Defense, in which the leaders of the major formations are represented. I think we have thereby already answered the point that we are united and subordinate to the Supreme Soviet—if, of course, the Supreme Soviet pursues a national policy. [end recording]

[Khomuryan] That seems to make sense; but how do you measure that national policy? What language of specific action in the Supreme Soviet—and in general—will be construed by the Armenian National Army as a party policy, and what as a total national policy? And what [words indistinct] They are armed formations—if they are trying to dictate their own terms to the democratically elected Supreme Soviet?

Armenian Revolutionary Federation Issues Statement *NC0908164990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian* *1630 GMT 8 Aug 90*

[Statement issued by the Bureau of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation in Yerevan City on 8 August]

[Text] In view of the present situation prevailing in the Armenian republic, particularly the danger threatening Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] and the requirements of the present phase of our ongoing national liberation struggle, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation [Hay Hegapokhakan Dashnaksutyun] announces its organizational presence throughout Armenia and informs the Armenian people that:

1. The Armenian Revolutionary Federation will soon have its own central office, an official press organ, and a press center in Armenia.

2. In the coming months, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation will present its official platform to the Armenians of Armenia on political, economic, communal, and social issues.

3. The Armenian Revolutionary Federation, drawing upon 100 years of experience in the national liberation armed struggle and moved by the exigency for unity in the struggle for national aspirations, will continue to place all its power and potential at the service of obtaining national and human rights for the Armenian people and of strengthening the fatherland politically, socially, economically, scientifically, and culturally.

Our struggle, extending from the formation of an autonomous Armenia to the creation of a united, free, and independent Armenia, will be long and difficult. We have to persevere, struggle, and attain our national [word indistinct] through gradual achievements. The Armenian Revolutionary Federation consciously assumes the mission that falls upon it in this path with commitment and dedication.

[Signed] Bureau of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation

[Dated] 8 August 1990, Yerevan City

Revolutionary Party Legalized

LD0908172590 Moscow TASS in English 1328 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Text] Yerevan August 9 ARMENPRESS-TASS—A message of the Dashnaktsutyun Party (the Armenian Revolutionary Union) Bureau to the Armenian parliament has been distributed here.

The message notes that the party "legalises its organisational existence on Armenian territory and announces that from now on it will have its central office, newspaper and information press centre in Armenia".

The message reads that in the coming months, the party will "present to the Armenian people its official platform for activities in the political, economic, public and social spheres".

The Dashnaktsutyun Party was founded in 1890, and between 1918-1920 it was the ruling party in bourgeois Armenia. After Soviet power was established in the republic, in February 1921, the party organised an anti-Soviet uprising. The party has many branches abroad.

Attacks Involving Firearms Reported in Armenia

Weapons Surrendered to MVD

PM0808133790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Aug 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent under the rubric "How the Presidential Decree Is Being Implemented": "Pistols on the Scrap Heap"]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jul—In the period 26 July through 30 July, 26 firearms were voluntarily surrendered to the country's law enforcement organs and 22 were confiscated by them, including five rifled firearms, the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] press center reported.

Crimes involving the use of weapons still continue in Armenia. Yesterday three armed persons attacked a special vehicle in Yerevan, which was transporting convicted murderer L. Arutyunyan from the people's court, and took him away. The "passenger" was being guarded by four militiamen from the Yerevan Internal Affairs Administration armed escort battalion. On the same day, eight armed thugs attacked the Martuninskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department. They seized a pistol, two bulletproof vests, a mine detector, two dosimeters, and five portable radio sets.

On Monday, in the city of Kutaisi in the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], 40 pistols were seized from the duty officer's safe in one of the Defense Ministry's military units. And all 40 were discovered in the division's trash heap the same day. The Kutaisi garrison military prosecutor's office is carrying out an investigation.

Anti-Crime Official Killed

LD0808142590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 8 Aug 90

[Text] In the last 24 hours in the country, 58 firearms have been handed over voluntarily. Also, 176 firearms and over 18,000 rounds of ammunition have been confiscated by law and order bodies. There are still no reports on the surrender of weapons coming from the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. In this situation the entire responsibility for the tragic consequences of using illegally kept weapons lies with the republican leadership, which tries to legalize the existence of various armed formations on the territory of Armenia.

On 7 August in Yerevan, in Ameryan Street, criminals using firearms killed the head of the Crime Prevention Department of the republican Ministry of Internal Affairs, who traveled in a private car and wore civilian clothes. On the same night in the Ilichevskiy Rayon of Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs were fired at with automatic weapons from the side of Armenia. Having met resistance, the criminals disappeared.

Situation in NKAO, Plans To Open Road Noted

NC0908165990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
0600 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Excerpts] One can describe the current political and social situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] as one of crisis and hope. Hope is aroused by the deliberations of the Armenian Supreme Soviet. The people of the NKAO were excited to learn that Levon Ter-Petrosyan had been elected chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet. The executive committee of the oblast soviet of people's deputies sent a congratulatory message to the leader of the republic. [passage omitted]

The policy to suppress the national liberation movement in the NKAO is assuming crueler dimensions. Therefore, one should not be surprised that social tension is not subsiding in the region. [passage omitted]

The military commandant's office in the NKAO had planned to open the Stepanakert-Idzhevan road, which passes through Kazakh, on 5 August, using patrols from the state automobile department and a guard detail from the troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry to protect vehicles traveling along the road. However, no one was willing to travel on that road. This is entirely understandable. First, what guarantees were there that travelers would reach their destination safely? Second, why have the soldiers assumed responsibility for protecting the movement of vehicles along a road which crosses a long section of Azerbaijan and not tried to open the road that leads to Goris instead? What is the hidden motive behind this move? The commandant insists on believing that there are people who want to travel to Idzhevan but who are prevented from purchasing tickets and using the road by local agitators. It appears that once again the Armenians are to be blamed for the continuing blockade and portrayed as preferring to live under conditions of a blockade. According to information provided by the military commandant, an internal troop post in Azerbaijan's Kelbadzharskiy Rayon came under fire on 5 August from unidentified persons who managed to escape. How can one be sure that a similar attack will not occur against a passenger bus in Agdamskiy or Kazakhskiy Rayons? Is it not to give minimum satisfaction to the wishes of the people of Karabakh before presenting them with demands? [passage omitted]

Azerbaijani Minister Cited on President's Decree

LD0908162190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 9 Aug 90

[Interview with Azerbaijan Internal Affairs Minister M.N. Asadov, by television correspondent M. Mamedov; place and date of interview not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Mamedov] Precisely two weeks have passed since the adoption of the decree of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR. What is being done in the republic in order to fulfil it successfully?

[Asadov] I have to state with all responsibility that there are no armed formations today in Baku and in rayons of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, although individuals are keeping weapons illegally. We are ascertaining [their identity] and are disarming them. Since this decree came into force on the territory of Azerbaijan, we have confiscated and the population has voluntarily handed in over 150 firearms, mainly hunting weapons. And we are continuing that work.

[Mamedov] Recently, there have been rumors going around that allegedly during incidents on the Soviet-Iran frontier, a large quantity of weapons was brought into Azerbaijan from the neighboring country. How much of that is true?

[Asadov] I categorically reject such fabrications and rumors. They have no foundation. Frankly speaking, those who want to justify their actions to create bandit formations are using them as a cover today.

Arrival of Refugees in Azerbaijan Reported

NC0808102390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 6 Aug 90

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs has disclosed the following: A total of 231 Azerbaijanis living in the Krasnovodsk Krai arrived in the Azerbaijan SSR on 3 and 4 August. A group of (?extremist) and nationalist individuals, who engaged in hooligan activities, created scuffles in the community hostel where they lived and in the market place where they sold their agricultural products.

A group composed of a number of the employees of the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and a number of social figures has left for the Krasnovodsk Krai to bring to light the causes of this incident.